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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 - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in the Republic of the Marshall Islands’ FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the Republic of the Marshall Islands must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - Required Actions

# 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), 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.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2020. A description of RMI's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public is provided in the following sections of this Introduction.  
  
Together with stakeholders, RMI reviewed all baselines and targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 and 17. New baselines were set as appropriate and all results indicators have targets identified for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR period. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no mediations or hearing requests in FFY 2020 and years prior. Indicators 11 and 13, considered to be indicators of compliance to IDEA requirements, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. Other compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP to be not applicable to RMI. This is due to RMI's circumstances as a Freely Associated State (FAS), therefore it does not have a Part C program (hence no Indicator 12) or its specific demographic characteristics (hence no Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 which measure discrepancies and disproportionalities based on race/ethnicity of students).  
  
RMI's FFY 2020 APR includes performance for the above indicators with explanation of slippage where applicable.  
  
RMI appreciates OSEP's support through its monthly TA calls to all states, and monthly calls with OSEP's team lead for RMI. With the exceptional technical assistance being provided by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C), RMI continues to improve its implementation of IDEA and improve the results for Marshallese children and youth with disabilities.

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

Aside from indicator 3, where data from math assessments for all high school students was not available due to a malfunction in the printing of those assessments, which invalidated those tests, RMI reported data for all indicators applicable to RMI in this report. The problem with Indicator 3 for math tests for High School students was not a direct impact of COVID-19, and the quality of the data here reported for all indicators was not impacted by the pandemic. Aside for this specific portion of the Indicator 3 data, all other data reported on RMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

**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.**

General supervision in the Marshall Islands, the responsibility of the Public School System (RMI PSS) Special Education Office, is comprised of the following eight components.   
  
State performance and improvement plans  
Policies, procedures, and effective implementation of IDEA  
Dispute resolutions  
Data on processes and results  
Integrated monitoring and evaluation activities  
Targeted technical assistance and personnel development  
Improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions  
Fiscal management  
  
Although each is a separate component, the components connect, interact, and articulate to form a comprehensive system with the objective of improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities in the RMI and ensuring that the RMI PSS meets the program requirements under this part, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.  
  
Supervision in the Marshall Islands also includes:  
  
Direct supervision of all public schools, programs, and services;   
Ongoing technical assistance to all schools and programs in the Marshall Islands;   
Data collection through an information management system;  
PSS program assessment through self-evaluation and improvement planning involving the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC);   
Annual review and compliance determination;   
Triennial (every 3 years) on-site monitoring to all schools;   
Management of special education complaints, mediation, and due process hearings, including dissemination of rights and procedures; and  
Resolution of issues through customary cultural practices, including disinterested parties.

**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.**

The Special Education Office provides ongoing and targeted technical assistance (TA) to schools.  
  
Ongoing TA is provided by special education specialists from the Special Education Office assigned to groups of schools. The assigned specialists maintain weekly contact with school personnel through on-site visits, telephone, short-wave radio, and/or web-based platforms. Targeted technical assistance to each of the 75 public elementary schools (grades K to 8); two public middle schools (on Majuro and Ebeye); and five public high schools (grades 9 to 12) located on 24 atolls in an area equivalent to the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River is provided based on the annual review and an annual special education school improvement plan. The process is described in the Marshall Islands Integrated and Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring Procedures (Revised September 2011 and 2020). The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) also includes an important intensive technical assistance component to middle and high schools, and targeted technical assistance to elementary schools.  
  
RMI technical assistance has been supported by TA from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT), and other OSEP-sponsored agencies.

**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.**

The RMI PSS maintains an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) for each special education teacher and staff that is updated annually during the Special Education Summer Institute. The plan guides the personnel development of the individual through workshops; coursework provided by the College of the Marshall Islands, Brigham Young University of Hawaii, and other institutions; the MOE certification requirements; and degree progression of AA, BA, and MA. The IDP assists the Special Education Office in planning and arranging for workshops needed; part-time and full-time study; improvement leaves; financial assistance; etc.  
  
In FFY 2020 RMI successfully bid for a grant to implement a personnel development project. Titled "Personnel Development to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities- Improving Retention of Special Education Teachers and Early Intervention Personnel". The purpose of this project is to develop a comprehensive retention plan for special education teachers in the Republic of the Marshall Islands Public School System. The specific goals of this project are to create a comprehensive retention plan for special educators, collectively with our partners at the College of the Marshall Islands and other stakeholders, develop meaningful pathways for professional development that will lead to special education licensure, effectively implement and evaluate the retention plan, and recruit more teachers and coaches annually to improve special education across RMI.   
  
RMI is in the initial stages of implementation of this project, having secured the support of program partners, and now is engaging stakeholders and collaborators in identifying barriers and facilitators to retaining special education teachers. In January 21st, in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls, RMI presented to stakeholders and collaborators a needs assessment survey to answer key questions about barriers and facilitators to special education teacher retention. Stakeholders and collaborators actively engaged with program partners who presented a draft of the survey. Feedback was noted and changes were made to the survey instrument, as well as recommendations were noted on best strategies to reach all special education teachers and principals in RMI schools.   
  
RMI PSS staff and leadership strongly believe this five-year plan will improve the mechanisms RMI PSS has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities in Marshall Islands schools.

**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).**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

4

**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.**

The group of stakeholders for the three days of activities for this reporting period, included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. Stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where data was available, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline. Stakeholders were able to answer/discuss the information provided based on these questions:  
  
1. Review the indicator data  
What story is the data telling?   
Are RMI schools improving on this indicator?   
What are possible explanations to RMI schools’ performance in this indicator?  
  
2. Review the Proposed Targets  
Do you agree with the proposed targets?  
Do you suggest different targets?  
  
3. Propose Improvement Strategies  
What can PSS and PSS Schools do to improve RMI performance in this indicator?  
  
Specific information about stakeholders input regarding the rational for targets setting is provided for each indicator in the appropriate location in each indicator.

**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.**

Stakeholders in the Republic of the Marshall Islands serve a fundamental role in the development, implementation, and ongoing evaluation of the RMI Public School System (PSS) SPP/APR, including the SSIP. Stakeholders provide feedback on targets, progress and assist with the dissemination of results to the general public, and are part of the implementation team. Stakeholders are informed on the SPP/APR/SSIP progress via online publication of the APR and SSIP and via meetings. Stakeholders network with the PSS team, meeting twice a year with the implementation teams. In specific for the SSIP, stakeholders collaborate with the SSIP team, participating on the SSIP Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA), helping evaluate, planning the implementation of SSIP activities. The stakeholders play a transforming role, they co-developed the school improvement plans, they work with the core team on the implementation of these plans.   
  
Here are examples of stakeholder engagement in the SSIP (using this same structure, stakeholders also receive professional development and provide input provide :   
  
Stakeholders (middle and high school teachers, principals, representatives from the College of Marshall Islands, parent groups, Special Education Advisory Council) remain on the SSIP team for implementation, partnering with high schools and community agencies to evaluate efforts of the SSIP. These stakeholders provided input into the design and development of the evaluation and have ensured the RMI PSS continues to (a) ask the right evaluation questions, (b) collect sufficient data to answer the evaluation questions, (c) analyze the data appropriately, and (d) use the data for secondary transition program improvement.   
  
In July 2021 we convened stakeholders to (a) update stakeholders on SSIP implementation and outcomes identified in the previous reporting period, and (b) reaffirm SSIP plan (including activities, evaluation, and responsibilities). Stakeholders began the meeting celebrating outcomes achieved during the last year of implementation of the SSIP, including continuing to surpass the SiMR target, despite a reduction in the percent of youth with disabilities graduating with a high school diploma.   
  
As we moved into our sixth PDSA cycle, stakeholders supported PSS in building capacity to deliver quality PD and coaching needed to support teachers in sustained implementation of evidence-based practices in schools. We continued to engage all stakeholders in the implementation and evaluation of the face-to-face meetings or online via Zoom. Stakeholders continued to reiterate the need for ongoing communication and training regarding transition topics to support their work in schools and insisted it be included as an ongoing activity in the SSIP.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

The RMI/PSS works closely with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) to solicit public input on all its activities, including the SPP/APR and the SSIP. The RMI PSS uses the two annual meetings to convene these group, together with other stakeholders and other PSS staff to solicit public input for activities such as setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. These meetings take pace in January and July of each year. In July 2021 and in January 2022, we met with the SEAC to confirm roles and responsibilities in relation to SPP/APR activities.   
  
Our principals also attend these bi-annual meetings and are responsible for ensuring the implementation of several SPP/APR activities. For example, they were instrumental in improving the participation of students with disabilities in the RMI statewide assessment (MISAT). For the SSIP, they are responsible for ensuring the implementation of the school improvement plans, the accurate collection of attendance data and fidelity data as teachers begin implementing some evidence-based practices in which they have been trained. Parent groups attend these meetings and also play a key role in providing and soliciting public input. Organizations such as the MIDPO, WUTMI, and the LDAH (parents and PTI groups), collected data on parent participation in parent workshops as well as parent knowledge and parent satisfaction data. They summarize these data and provide to the team to inform future plans.

**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.**

During the two annual meetings (January and July) described in other sessions of this report, the RMI PSS prepares summary reports of progress to the stakeholders and to the public in general. Whenever possible, during these two times of the year, RMI staff summarizes progress reports in a press release format which is submitted to the Marshall Islands Journal for general public availability. The editor of the newspaper publishes the press releases.   
  
Information that is summarized and provided both to the public on press releases and in more detail to the stakeholders attending the two annual meetings include: RMI's submission of the IDEA Grant, RMI's progress in implementing IDEA (determination status and RDA results matrix), and in more detail, it includes individual progress on each SPP/APR indicator, and in specific progress on the implementation of the SSIP. Stakeholders have opportunities to discuss the progress on all these reports, and in each specific indicator. In general, when an indicator requires more intensive attention, such as was the case for the participation of special education students in the MISAT, stakeholders are invited to work more closely with PSS staff to engage in a PDSA activity. This includes an activity to understand the issue, be involved on a root cause analysis process, provide or suggest strategies for improvement and be part of the implementation team where applicable. This activity generated a very positive impact on the participation of students with disabilities in the MISAT, which is reflected in moving from a 20% participation rate to more than 90% participation rate in three years of intensive support from PSS staff and implementation of improvement strategies.   
  
All RMI PSS reports are also available in the RMI PSS website for the public to review and provide input. These reports are made available to the public shortly after being submitted to the United States Department of Education.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

All RMI PSS reports, including the FFY 2019 SPP/APR and the SSIP are available in the RMI PSS website for the public to review and provide input. These reports are made available to the public shortly after being submitted to the United States Department of Education. Whenever revisions are made to the SPP/APR and the SSIP, the report with revisions is re-uploaded in a timely fashion (shortly after changes are made).  
  
Here is the link to the FFY 2019 SPP/APR and the SSIP and all other reports:  
  
https://pss.edu.mh/documents/special-education-documents/

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 31.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 38.00% | 40.00% | 42.00% | 44.00% | 46.00% |
| Data | 33.33% | 46.15% | 25.00% | 80.00% | 92.59% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% | 54.00% | 56.00% | 58.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

Stakeholders reviewed the data trends and the previous targets on this indicator. Stakeholders indicated that although the data has shown great progress over the last years, staying above the targets, that the number of students leaving the PSS system every year is very small (20 students exited the system in SY 2019-2020), and that it fluctuates from year to year. Stakeholders indicated these small numbers can result in large fluctuations on the graduation rates when one or two students receive a certificate instead of a regular diploma, for example. Therefore, the stakeholders suggested to keep the baseline and the progression of previous targets (improvements of 2% per year).  
  
Please note: RMI always used File 009 to calculate the graduation rate of students with disabilities (RMI does not submit ESEA data like other states). And RMI previously calculated graduation rates using the same methodology that is suggested for this indicator for FFY 2020-2025. Therefore, RMI does not need to calculate a new baseline for this indicator.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | \*[[1]](#footnote-2)1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | \*[[2]](#footnote-3)1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 0 |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*[[3]](#footnote-4)1 | \*[[4]](#footnote-5)1 | 92.59% | 48.00% | \*[[5]](#footnote-6)1 | 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.**

To receive the public high school diploma, students in grade twelve, seniors, shall meet the Public School System and school academic requirements:  
  
(1) Each student (grades 9-12) must maintain a minimum grade point average of 2.00 each grading semester. A student who does not maintain the minimum grade point average of 2.00 for the first semester of the senior year shall be placed on academic probation for the remainder of the school year;   
(2) Each student must complete twenty-one (21) credits, including eleven credits in the student’s required academic/vocational program and MLA and maintain 2.00 GPA in order to receive a “diploma” upon graduation;   
(3) Twelve (12) graders who do not meet 2.00 GPA requirements but have completed all credits and course requirements for graduation shall be awarded a “certificate of completion” upon graduation;   
(4) Each student must attend a public high school for at least one year prior to graduation. An exception may be granted by the Commissioner for transferring students from outside the Republic.   
(5) Secondary school students shall be required to complete 20 hours of community service for each program year for a total of 80 hours for graduation. The high school office shall make necessary arrangements for students to meet community service requirements.   
  
This information is available on the Marshall Islands Public School System Rules and Regulations, Chapter 29 (Page 54-56).

**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)**

Please note: RMI always used File 009 to calculate the graduation rate of students with disabilities (RMI does not submit ESEA data like other states). And RMI previously calculated graduation rates using the same methodology that is suggested for this indicator for FFY 2020-2025. Therefore, RMI does not need to calculate a new baseline for this indicator.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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**

OPTION 1:

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.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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**

OPTION 1:

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.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.

**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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). 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.

OPTION 2:

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.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[6]](#footnote-7)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | \*[[7]](#footnote-8) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 2.28% | 0.92% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | \*2 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

Stakeholders agreed with the decision of RMI/PSS to already move to OSEP's Option 1 methodology for this indicator since it will be a requirement for all states in the next year. RMI PSS used the FFY 2020 data to generate a new baseline for this indicator. Because the performance was 0% dropout rates, that's the target for FFY 2025 and all other years in between.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | \*[[8]](#footnote-9)1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | \*[[9]](#footnote-10)1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 0 |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*[[10]](#footnote-11)1 | \*[[11]](#footnote-12)1 | 0.00% | \*[[12]](#footnote-13)1 | \*[[13]](#footnote-14)1 | N/A | N/A |

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

The RMI PSS uses the OSEP 618 definition for "Dropped Out" which states the total number of students who were enrolled at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period and did not exit through any other method. This includes dropouts, runaways, GED recipients, expulsions, status unknown, students who moved and are unknown to be continuing in another educational program, and students exiting the system in other ways. This method of collecting dropout data is consistent for all students.

**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

RMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 3 | FFY 2020 | 91.11% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | FFY 2020 | 96.00% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | FFY 2020 | 81.13% |
| Math | A | Grade 3 | FFY 2020 | 91.11% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | FFY 2020 | 96.00% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | FFY 2021 |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 | 91.11% | 91.50% | 92.00% | 92.50% | 93.00% | 94.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.50% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 81.13% | 90.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% | 94.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 | 91.11% | 91.50% | 92.00% | 92.50% | 93.00% | 94.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.50% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

This was a new measurement and stakeholders agreed that FFY 2020 should be the baseline data for all measures of this indicator. Stakeholders also decided that targets should start at a minimum of 90% participation rate for Reading HS, since this is an important indicator to meet requirements that all students with disabilities participate in assessments and for RMI PSS schools to put the effort to obtain maximum scores in the RDA Results Matrix.  
Data for Math assessments for HS students was not available this year. Stakeholders are set to get together and establish a baseline and targets for this indicator when data becomes available in FFY 2021.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 45 | 50 | 53 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 41 | 48 | 43 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 45 | 50 |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 0 | 0 |  |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 41 | 48 |  |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 0 | 0 |  |

\*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 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 41 | 45 |  | 91.11% | 91.11% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 48 | 50 |  | 96.00% | 96.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 43 | 53 |  | 81.13% | 81.13% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | 41 | 45 |  | 91.11% | 91.11% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 48 | 50 |  | 96.00% | 96.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | 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.**

RMI does not submit ESEA data. The following link provides the information where special education data is reported to the public based on the APR data which includes (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)]   
  
https://pss.edu.mh/documents/special-education-documents/  
  
The data for students with disabilities is reported in the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children.  
  
Please note that due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Republic of the Marshall Islands did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

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

Please note that in SY 2020-21, the RMI Assessment Team canceled its implementation of the High School Mathematics assessments due to printing errors on grades 10 & 12 grade math tests which made quite a few test items unreadable. This resulted in the RMI Assessment Team’s inability to assess many of the benchmarks of the test, therefore a decision was made that RMI would not score and report results for Mathematics High School assessment for the year 2021. Therefore, RMI is not submitting high school data on math assessments for FFY 2020.  
  
The RMI team informed PSC and OSEP about this situation. Following recommendations made about this issue, the RMI Data Manager submitted a very detailed data note to OMB Max regarding the situation with the High School math assessments, explaining the reasons for which that assessment was not administered for SY 2020-21. RMI Assessment Office has indicated this assessment will be implemented in SY 2021-22.  
  
RMI is using Grade 3 in place of Grade 4 for this indicator because RMI Public School System does not assess students in Grade 4 (with our without disabilities).

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

RMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, for 3rd grade Reading, 8th grade Reading, HS Reading, 3rd grade Math, and 8th grade Math, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets for 3rd grade Reading, 8th grade Reading, HS Reading, 3rd grade Math, and 8th grade Math. RMI did not provide targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for HS Math.  
  
RMI reported it did not provide any data for HS math because RMI "canceled its implementation of the High School Mathematics assessments due to printing errors on grades 10 & 12 grade math tests which made quite a few test items unreadable." RMI reported the high school mathematics assessment "will be implemented in SY 2021-22."

## 3A - Required Actions

OSEP's response to RMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required RMI to provide OSEP with a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2019, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). RMI provided the required information.  
  
Within 90 days of the receipt of RMI's 2022 determination letter, RMI must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds RMI that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, RMI must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

# 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 3 | FFY 2020 | \*[[14]](#footnote-15)1 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | FFY 2020 | \*[[15]](#footnote-16)1 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | FFY 2020 | \*[[16]](#footnote-17)1 |
| Math | A | Grade 3 | FFY 2020 | \*[[17]](#footnote-18)1 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | FFY 2020 | \*[[18]](#footnote-19)1 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | FFY 2021 |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 | \*[[19]](#footnote-20)1 | 22.00% | 22.50% | 23.00% | 23.50% | 24.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | \*[[20]](#footnote-21)1 | 8.50% | 9.00% | 9.50% | 10.00% | 10.50% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | \*[[21]](#footnote-22)1 | 7.00% | 7.50% | 8.00% | 8.50% | 9.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 | \*[[22]](#footnote-23)1 | 24.50% | 25.00% | 25.50% | 26.00% | 26.50% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | \*[[23]](#footnote-24)1 | 8.50% | 9.00% | 9.50% | 10.00% | 10.50% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

This was a new measurement and stakeholders agreed that FFY 2020 should be the baseline data for all measures of this indicator. Stakeholders also decided that targets should have a progress of .50 percentage progress per year all the way to FFY 2025.  
  
Data for Math assessments for HS students was not available this year. Stakeholders are set to get together and establish a baseline and targets for this indicator when data becomes available in FFY 2021.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 41 | 48 | 43 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[24]](#footnote-25)1 | \*[[25]](#footnote-26)1 | \*[[26]](#footnote-27)1 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 9 | 4 | \*[[27]](#footnote-28)1 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 41 | 48 |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[28]](#footnote-29)1 | \*[[29]](#footnote-30)1 |  |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 10 | 4 |  |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | \*[[30]](#footnote-31)1 | 41 |  | \*[[31]](#footnote-32)1 | \*[[32]](#footnote-33)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[33]](#footnote-34)1 | 48 |  | \*[[34]](#footnote-35)1 | \*[[35]](#footnote-36)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[36]](#footnote-37)1 | 43 |  | \*[[37]](#footnote-38)1 | \*[[38]](#footnote-39)1 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | \*[[39]](#footnote-40)1 | 41 |  | \*[[40]](#footnote-41)1 | \*[[41]](#footnote-42)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[42]](#footnote-43)1 | 48 |  | \*[[43]](#footnote-44)1 | \*[[44]](#footnote-45)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | 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.**

RMI does not submit ESEA data. The following link provides the information where special education data is reported to the public based on the APR data which includes (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)]   
  
https://pss.edu.mh/documents/special-education-documents/  
  
The data for students with disabilities are reported in the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children.  
  
Please note that due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Republic of the Marshall Islands did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator

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

Please note that in SY 2020-21, the RMI Assessment Team canceled its implementation of the High School Mathematics assessments due to printing errors on grades 10 & 12 grade math tests which made quite a few test items unreadable. This resulted in the RMI Assessment Team’s inability to assess many of the benchmarks of the test, therefore a decision was made that RMI would not score and report results for Mathematics High School assessment for the year 2021. Therefore, RMI is not submitting high school data on math assessments for FFY 2020.  
  
The RMI team informed PSC and OSEP about this situation. Following recommendations made about this issue, the RMI Data Manager submitted a very detailed data note to OMB Max regarding the situation with the High School math assessments, explaining the reasons for which that assessment was not administered for SY 2020-21. RMI Assessment Office has indicated this assessment will be implemented in SY 2021-22.  
  
RMI is using Grade 3 in place of Grade 4 for this indicator because RMI Public School System does not assess students in Grade 4 (with our without disabilities).

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The RMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, for 3rd grade Reading, 8th grade Reading, HS Reading, 3rd grade Math, and 8th grade Math, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets for 3rd grade Reading, 8th grade Reading, HS Reading, 3rd grade Math, and 8th grade Math. The RMI did not provide targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for HS Math.  
  
The RMI reported it did not provide any data for HS math because RMI "canceled its implementation of the High School Mathematics assessments due to printing errors on grades 10 & 12 grade math tests which made quite a few test items unreadable." The RMI reported the high school mathematics assessment "will be implemented in SY 2021-22."

## 3B - Required Actions

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required the State to provide OSEP with a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2019, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). The RMI provided the required information.  
  
Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the RMI must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the RMI that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the RMI must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

# 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 3 |  |  |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Reading | C | Grade HS |  |  |
| Math | A | Grade 3 |  |  |
| Math | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Math | C | Grade HS |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

The stakeholders are informed that no students with disabilities took the alternate assessment in SY 2020-21. There is one student who will possibly be assessed using alternate assessments in SY 2021-22. Stakeholders ask whether RMI PSS should report baseline and targets on this indicator if it is based on few students.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | \*[[45]](#footnote-46)1 | \*[[46]](#footnote-47)1 | \*[[47]](#footnote-48)1 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 0 | 0 |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | \*[[48]](#footnote-49)1 | \*[[49]](#footnote-50)1 |  |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | \*[[50]](#footnote-51)1 | 0 |  | \*[[51]](#footnote-52)1 | \*[[52]](#footnote-53)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[53]](#footnote-54)1 | 0 |  | \*[[54]](#footnote-55)1 | \*[[55]](#footnote-56)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[56]](#footnote-57)1 | 0 |  | \*[[57]](#footnote-58)1 | \*[[58]](#footnote-59)1 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | \*[[59]](#footnote-60)1 | 0 |  | \*[[60]](#footnote-61)1 | \*[[61]](#footnote-62)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[62]](#footnote-63)1 | 0 |  | \*[[63]](#footnote-64)1 | \*[[64]](#footnote-65)1 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | 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.**

RMI does not submit ESEA data. The following link provides the information where special education data is reported to the public based on the APR data which includes (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)]   
  
https://pss.edu.mh/documents/special-education-documents/  
  
The data for students with disabilities is reported in the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children.  
  
Please note that due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Republic of the Marshall Islands did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

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

The stakeholders are informed that no students with disabilities took the alternate assessment in SY 2020-21. There is one student who will possibly be assessed using alternate assessments in SY 2021-22. Stakeholders ask whether RMI PSS should report baseline and targets on this indicator if it is based on few students.  
  
RMI is using Grade 3 in place of Grade 4 for this indicator because RMI Public School System does not assess students in Grade 4 (with our without disabilities).

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The RMI did not provide baseline or targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator. The RMI reported that "no students with disabilities took the alternate assessment in SY 2020-21."

## 3C - Required Actions

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR required the State to provide OSEP with a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2019, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). The State provided the required information.  
  
Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

# 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 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 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 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 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 3 | FFY 2020 | 14.36 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | FFY 2020 | 25.12 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | FFY 2020 | 16.11 |
| Math | A | Grade 3 | FFY 2020 | 19.29 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | FFY 2020 | 15.93 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | FFY 2021 |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 3 | 14.36 | 14.00 | 13.75 | 13.50 | 13.25 | 13.00 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 25.12 | 25.00 | 24.75 | 24.50 | 24.25 | 24.00 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 16.11 | 16.00 | 15.75 | 15.50 | 15.25 | 15.00 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 3 | 19.29 | 18.50 | 18.25 | 18.00 | 17.75 | 17.50 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 15.93 | 15.50 | 15.25 | 15.00 | 14.75 | 14.50 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

This was a new measurement and stakeholders agreed that FFY 2020 should be the baseline data for all measures of this indicator. Data for Math assessments for HS students was not available this year. Stakeholders are set to get together and establish a baseline and targets for this indicator when data becomes available in FFY 2021.  
  
Stakeholders used the Targets set for 3B to establish targets for 3D. They observed that, assuming general education students do not progress in their proficiency rates for each of the six measures (five measures until RMI collects math HS data), then the gap will be reduced by the progress students with disabilities make in 3B minus what their progress on 3B will improve the data for "all students" (since special education students are included in the "all students" categories). Based on this observation, stakeholders decided to set targets to reduce the gap on all five measures for this indicator which are available in FFY 2020, by using a final FFY 2025 target that is smaller than the projected gains by FFY 2025 for indicator 3B.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 950 | 1,088 | 1,139 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 41 | 48 | 43 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[65]](#footnote-66)1 | \*[[66]](#footnote-67)1 | \*[[67]](#footnote-68)1 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 9 | 4 | \*[[68]](#footnote-69)1 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[69]](#footnote-70)1 | \*[[70]](#footnote-71)1 | \*[[71]](#footnote-72)1 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 9 | 4 | \*[[72]](#footnote-73)1 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 941 | 1,088 |  |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 41 | 48 |  |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[73]](#footnote-74)1 | \*[[74]](#footnote-75)1 |  |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 10 | 4 |  |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | \*[[75]](#footnote-76)1 | \*[[76]](#footnote-77)1 |  |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 10 | 4 |  |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | \*[[77]](#footnote-78)1 | \*[[78]](#footnote-79)1 |  | 14.36 | 14.36 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[79]](#footnote-80)1 | \*[[80]](#footnote-81)1 |  | 25.12 | 25.12 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | \*[[81]](#footnote-82)1 | \*[[82]](#footnote-83)1 |  | 16.11 | 16.11 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3 | \*[[83]](#footnote-84)1 | \*[[84]](#footnote-85)1 |  | 19.29 | 19.29 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | \*[[85]](#footnote-86)1 | \*[[86]](#footnote-87)1 |  | 15.93 | 15.93 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

Please note that in SY 2020-21, the RMI Assessment Team canceled its implementation of the High School Mathematics assessments due to printing errors on grades 10 & 12 grade math tests which made quite a few test items unreadable. This resulted in the RMI Assessment Team’s inability to assess many of the benchmarks of the test, therefore a decision was made that RMI would not score and report results for Mathematics High School assessment for the year 2021. Therefore, RMI is not submitting high school data on math assessments for FFY 2020.  
  
The RMI team informed PSC and OSEP about this situation. Following recommendations made about this issue, the RMI Data Manager submitted a very detailed data note to OMB Max regarding the situation with the High School math assessments, explaining the reasons for which that assessment was not administered for SY 2020-21. RMI Assessment Office has indicated this assessment will be implemented in SY 2021-22.  
  
RMI is using Grade 3 in place of Grade 4 for this indicator because RMI Public School System does not assess students in Grade 4 (with our without disabilities).

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

The RMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, for 3rd grade Reading, 8th grade Reading, HS Reading, 3rd grade Math, and 8th grade Math, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets for 3rd grade Reading, 8th grade Reading, HS Reading, 3rd grade Math, and 8th grade Math. The RMI did not provide targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for HS Math.  
  
The RMI reported it did not provide any data for HS math because RMI "canceled its implementation of the High School Mathematics assessments due to printing errors on grades 10 & 12 grade math tests which made quite a few test items unreadable." The RMI reported the high school mathematics assessment "will be implemented in SY 2021-22."

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), 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 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

Stakeholders reviewed the data and given the historic nature of this indicator, with zero suspension and expulsions for students with disabilities, the stakeholders decided to keep the original baseline and set targets that continue at the zero percent level.

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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**

The RMI/PSS is a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the only LEA in the Marshall Islands. The RMI/PSS status as a unitary system makes applying the actual measurement for Indicator 4a challenging.  
  
Considering the two options for methodologies prescribed for this indicator (a) the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State or b) the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs), the only one that can be implemented in RMI, as a unitary system, is option b) but with the adaptation of using statewide data to compare rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the state. Similar methodology is used for other unitary systems such as Puerto Rico, Federated States of Micronesia, and Hawaii among other states and entities with unitary systems.  
  
RMI/PSS methodology is a rate difference methodology, which compares rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to the statewide bar, which is defined as the state’s suspension expulsion rate for nondisabled children within the state (as a single LEA). This is one of the OSEP approved comparison methodologies that is used to determine whether significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspension and expulsion are occurring between children with disabilities and children without disabilities [34 CFR §300.170(a)].  
  
The rate difference methodology used by RMI/PSS compares the rate of expulsions and suspensions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs compared to the rate for nondisabled children. The equation for the rate difference is: Rate difference = state suspension/expulsion (S/E) rate for children with disabilities minus (-) the state S/E rate for children without disabilities. RMI/PSS defines “significant discrepancy” when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least three percentage points more than the State’s suspension/expulsion rate for all children without disabilities.  
The RMI/PSS uses a minimum “n” size requirement to operate the calculation. Thus, if there are fewer than 10 students with disabilities who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year, the calculation does not take place.   
  
FFY 2020 Calculation  
  
The suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities in RMI/PSS, using SY 2019-20 data from Section 618 File C005 as submitted on November of 2020, indicates zero students with disabilities were suspended. As such, no further analysis was required. Therefore, in RMI/PSS, in FFY 2020, the number of “districts” that have a significant discrepancy is zero.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.**

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §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 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), 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 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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:**

The RMI PSS is a single district entity with a population that is homogeneous when measured by race/ethnicity. All families and students are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders.

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| A | 78.06% | Data | 83.85% | 73.24% | 72.46% | 74.58% | 77.90% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 5.00% |
| B | 26.20% | Data | 0.26% | 0.16% | 0.00% | 0.17% | 0.81% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 0.95% | 0.95% |
| C | 1.40% | Data | 0.65% | 0.47% | 0.34% | 0.51% | 0.97% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 78.06% | 78.50% | 78.75% | 79.00% | 78.25% | 79.50% |
| Target B <= | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| Target C <= | 1.41% | 1.40% | 1.40% | 1.40% | 1.40% | 1.40% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

In reviewing these data, stakeholders decided to maintain the baseline for 5B, and set targets the continue the trend identified in previous years. For 5A and 5C, stakeholders decided to use FFY 2020 as the baseline data. Stakeholders argued that the previous targets were too high (for 5A), too low (for 5C), making it practically impossible for the state to match them, especially considering IEP teams decide what is the best LRE for each student. Furthermore, compared to national data, using last years data, RMI is performing above the national average on both 5A and 5C.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 711 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 555 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 8 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 10 |

**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 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 555 | 711 | 77.90% | 78.06% | 78.06% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 8 | 711 | 0.81% | 5.00% | 1.13% | 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] | 10 | 711 | 0.97% | 1.41% | 1.41% | N/A | N/A |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The RMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A** | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% |
| **A** | Data | 100.00% | 97.44% | 96.00% | 100.00% | 56.00% |
| **B** | Target <= | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 4.00% | 4.00% |
| **B** | Data | 0.00% | 2.56% | 4.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

This is a transition year for preschool programs in RMI. Prior to FFY 2020, RMI had a preschool program, it was closed in FFY 2020, and all preschool students were served in their homes temporarily. In FFY 2020 RMI is transitioning to a new preschool program, integrated with the elementary schools. Therefore, the stakeholders decided to make FFY 2020 a new baseline year, and set targets during FFY 2020. The RMI stakeholders proposed targets for FFY 2025 that reflect improvement over the State's FFY 2020 baseline data. Please note that for 6B, the FFY 2020 data at 0%, which is the new baseline for 6B, is already the best possible target RMI schools can reach (RMI stakeholders want more students to attend a regular early childhood program, 6A, and not a separate special education class, 6B).

**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 | 0.00% |
| **B** | 2020 | 0.00% |
| **C** | 2020 | 100.00% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 0.00% | 2.00% | 4.00% | 6.00% | 8.00% | 10.00% |
| Target B <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 100.00% | 98.00% | 96.00% | 94.00% | 92.00% | 90.00% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 |

**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 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 | 0 | 7 | 56.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 0 | 7 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 7 | 7 |  | 100.00% | 100.00% | N/A | N/A |

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

This is a transition year for preschool programs in RMI. Prior to FFY 2020, RMI had a preschool program, it was closed in FFY 2019, and all preschool students were served in their homes temporarily. In FFY 2020 RMI is transitioning to a new preschool program, integrated with the elementary schools. Therefore, the stakeholders decided to make FFY 2020 a new baseline year, and set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for this indicator. The RMI stakeholders proposed targets for FFY 2025 that reflect improvement over the State's FFY 2020 baseline data. Please note that for 6B, the FFY 2020 data at 0%, which is the new baseline for 6B, is already the best possible target RMI schools can reach, therefore the FFY 2025 target is also 0%.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The RMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The RMI reported fewer than ten children receiving special education and related services in the home in FFY 2020. The RMI is not required to provide targets for Indicator 6C until any fiscal year in which ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.

## 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2018 | Target >= | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 100.00% | 40.00% |
| A1 | 37.50% | Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 81.82% | 37.50% | 63.64% |
| A2 | 2018 | Target >= | 40.00% | 42.00% | 44.00% | 76.00% | 15.00% |
| A2 | 12.50% | Data | 72.73% | 85.71% | 78.95% | 12.50% | 36.36% |
| B1 | 2018 | Target >= | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 100.00% | 27.50% |
| B1 | 25.00% | Data | 80.00% | 90.00% | 100.00% | 25.00% | 72.73% |
| B2 | 2018 | Target >= | 30.00% | 32.00% | 34.00% | 36.00% | 15.00% |
| B2 | 12.50% | Data | 72.73% | 76.19% | 84.21% | 12.50% | 18.18% |
| C1 | 2018 | Target >= | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 100.00% | 65.00% |
| C1 | 62.50% | Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 62.50% | 81.82% |
| C2 | 2018 | Target >= | 20.00% | 22.00% | 24.00% | 26.00% | 40.00% |
| C2 | 37.50% | Data | 63.64% | 100.00% | 94.74% | 37.50% | 18.18% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 42.00% | 44.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 17.50% | 19.00% | 21.50% | 23.00% | 25.50% | 28.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 30.00% | 32.50% | 35.00% | 37.50% | 40.00% | 42.50% |
| Target B2 >= | 17.50% | 19.00% | 21.50% | 23.00% | 25.50% | 28.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 67.50% | 70.00% | 72.50% | 75.00% | 77.50% | 80.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 42.00% | 44.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

In particular with this indicator, stakeholders decided to keep the FFY 2018 baseline and continue the data progression established by the FFY 2019 targets all the way to FFY 2025. The stakeholders noticed that the historical data table above has an error. Follow row A1, Baseline 2018, all the way to the value in the cell under FFY 2018. It reads 100.0%, but it should had been 37.5%, which is the value for the new baseline set in 2018. The same error repeats to all 2018 target values for measures A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

9

**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 | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 4 | 44.44% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 5 | 55.56% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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)* | 9 | 9 | 63.64% | 42.00% | 100.00% | 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)* | 5 | 9 | 36.36% | 17.50% | 55.56% | Met target | No 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 | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 4 | 44.44% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 5 | 55.56% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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)* | 9 | 9 | 72.73% | 30.00% | 100.00% | 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)* | 5 | 9 | 18.18% | 17.50% | 55.56% | Met 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 | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 6 | 66.67% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 33.33% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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)* | 9 | 9 | 81.82% | 67.50% | 100.00% | 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)* | 3 | 9 | 18.18% | 42.00% | 33.33% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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.**

RMI used the MID (Micronesian Inventory of Development) scoring sheet to collect pre and post data from preschool students in Ebeye and Majuro preschools. These data is then transferred/translated to the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process for each preschool student which, when aggregated, provided the data for items a, b, c, d and e of outcomes A, B and C for indicator B7.

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

The stakeholders noticed that the historical data table above has an error. Follow row A1, Baseline 2018, all the way to the value in the cell under FFY 2018. It reads 100.0%, but it should had been 37.5%, which is the value for the new baseline set in 2018. The same error repeats to all 2018 target values for measures A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, 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 parents of children with disabilities.

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 should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting 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 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.

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**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

The stakeholders agreed to a 95% target for this indicator, maintaining the FF 2019 target. The parent survey will be changed before parental data is collected for the FFY 2031 APR. Stakeholders will be convened to analyze the new baseline and set new targets for FFY 2021-2025 for this indicator.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 92.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.50% | 95.00% |
| Data | 91.89% | 93.75% | 91.94% | 94.12% | 92.98% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 207 | | 259 | 92.98% | 95.00% | 79.92% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The main reasons for slippage could be that: 1) more parents are invited to engage with PSS staff during on-site school review meetings, and therefore may have higher expectations of their role in the education of their children (which is actually a positive outcome); 2) COVID did limit the frequency of interaction with parent groups from different atolls and to parent organizations; and 3) RMI PSS made a greater effort to collect surveys from a larger number of parents (from 114 parents in FFY 2019 to 259 parents in FFY 2020), which may include parents that have not been as engaged with their children's education as they would have liked.

**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 procedures for collecting parent survey data from preschool children is the same as the procedures for collecting data from school age students. Parent survey data reported in the FFY 2020 APR is representative of the two groups.

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

259

**Percentage of respondent parents**

100.00%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**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 RMI PSS will continue to work to distribute surveys to a larger number of parents. The most important strategy to reach more families for next reporting periods is that the PSS team redesigned the parent survey. The new survey will have only 10 questions. We believe this will help in increasing the reach to parents and will allow more parents to respond.

**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.**

In the last few years the PSS team has made improvements to the data collection process to reach more parents. The PSS team does not believe there was any nonresponse bias. The PSS team use several activities to reach the maximum number of parents, including using parent organizations to reach parents, visits to schools during monitoring activities, and visit to schools during in-school training events. RMI also uses annual events such as the Special Education Summer Institute, to which parents are invited to attend and receive training, and the annual Disability Awareness Week.

**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 should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.**

The target population and the respondents match 100% in terms of race ethnicity, where, both in the target population and the survey respondents, 100% of the population is composed of Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders. In future years, with the revised survey, the PSS team will collect from the parents what are the age of their child and the disability category. To measure the representativeness of the new demographic groups, RMI will use the +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

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

YES

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

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

The target population and the respondents match 100% in terms of race ethnicity, where, both in the target population and the survey respondents, 100% of the population is composed of Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders. However, for next year, RMI will use the +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group to measure representativeness for additional demographic groups.

| **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)**

The RMI team is revising the parent survey. The new survey will have less questions and will require setting a new baseline and targets from FFY 2021 to FFY 2025.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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.**

The RMI PSS is a single district entity with a population that is homogeneous when measured by race/ethnicity. All families and students are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 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 FFY 2020, 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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**

The RMI PSS is a single district entity with a population that is homogeneous when measured by race/ethnicity. All families and students are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 49 | 49 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

0

**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.**

**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.**

Data Source: The child find data is located in the Special Education Information Management System (SEIMS), administered and maintained by the PSS Special Education Office. Schools submit semi-annual reports of special education programs and services provided during the report period and on an on-going basis, submit copies of special education forms related to referral (Form SE-1), child study (SE-2), consent for evaluation (SE-4), integrated evaluation and determination (report on SE-5), program and placement (attachments of each student's current Individualized Education Program (IEP/SE-7)) Plan and reevaluation. Data from school reports and student IEP are summarized into the SEIMS. The information collected are validated through on-site visits and through off-site monitoring. The above information is provided through a report that summarizes the timeframe from consent for evaluation (SE-4) to completion of the evaluation (SE-5).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

# 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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.**

YES

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

The Republic of the Marshall Islands is a Freely Associated State, and as such, the RMI PSS does not receive Part C funds of IDEA, nor 619 funds. Therefore, indicator B12, which measures that students transitioning from Part C to Part B should have an IEP by their 3rd birthday is not applicable.

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 46 | 46 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

State monitoring

**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.**

Each year, all schools submit IEPs for students to the PSS. Data from IEPs are entered into the special education information management system for review and analysis regarding placement, appropriate accommodations, etc. For secondary transition, during onsite monitoring visits, PSS requested one IEP file of students ages 16 and above per case manager (n=46) to review. Each IEP was reviewed using the RMI Quality IEP Rubric which includes items included in the National Secondary Transition and Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) Part B Indicator 13 Checklist A.

| **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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

# 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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 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.

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 should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 10.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% |
| A | 0.00% | Data | 18.18% | 21.43% | 12.50% | 30.00% | 20.00% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 10.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% |
| B | 0.00% | Data | 45.45% | 57.14% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 64.00% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 70.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| C | 0.00% | Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 16.00% | 16.50% | 17.00% | 17.50% | 18.00% | 18.50% |
| Target B >= | 17.00% | 19.00% | 21.00% | 23.00% | 25.00% | 25.00% |
| Target C >= | 76.00% | 76.50% | 77.00% | 77.50% | 78.00% | 78.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

The baseline for this indicator was maintained. Stakeholders, similar to other indicators, decided to continue the target trends from previous years. The exception was for 14B, that had the same targets as 14A in the past. Stakeholders indicated they wanted to see a higher target level for this component of 14, since 14B data is an accumulation of youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (14A data) and youth who are competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 20 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 20 |
| Response Rate | 100.00% |
| 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 | 4 |
| 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) | 1 |
| 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). | 8 |

| **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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 7 | 20 | 20.00% | 16.00% | 35.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 11 | 20 | 64.00% | 17.00% | 55.00% | Met 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) | 20 | 20 | 100.00% | 76.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 100.00% | 100.00% |

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

Very few students exit the RMI PSS every year. The PSS staff contacts all high school teachers to make sure post school information is collected from all students who exit the school system. RMI PSS will continue this effort going forward, to maintain the 100% response rate for this indicator.

**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.**

Response rate was 100% and there was no non-response bias. Twenty of the twenty students who exited PSS in SY 2019-20 were contacted. 100% of their responses about their status after leaving school were received, making their response 100% representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.  
  
Data is 100% representative of the population because ALL the 20 students (100%) who exited in SY 2019-209 responded to the interview. That is, it is 100% representative based on gender, race, disability, and school of the exiting population.

**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.**

Data is 100% representative of the population because ALL the 20 students (100%) who exited in SY 2019-209 responded to the interview. That is, it is 100% representative based on gender, race, disability, and school of the exiting population.

**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)**

YES

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

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

There was no need to apply any metric, since all 20 leavers in 2019-20 were contacted and information regarding the post school outcomes was gathered from all these 20 leavers. If in a subsequent year, RMI is not able to collect data from 100% of the target students, RMI will use the +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group to measure and determine representativeness in the collected data.

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

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

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 14 - Required Actions

# 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 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**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

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.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

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.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The RMI reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. The RMI 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 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**

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

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.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

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.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The RMI reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The RMI 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 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, 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 2020 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 2020 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 2021). 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 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

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 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) 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)?**

To increase the percentage of youth with disabilities graduating with a high school diploma in the Marshall Islands Public School System.

**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)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

The current Theory of Action is located here, together with RMI's SSIP reports:  
  
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1hXcWS5JwtZ54PzzcranoeG1Wzyxrtrt1  
  
If there are any problems following that link, please follow this link and then select SSIP Reports:  
  
https://pss.edu.mh/documents/special-education-documents/

**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 RMI PSS continues its progress on the implementation of the SSIP. Although in some years the data may show slippage, in the overall trend, the graduation rates show improvement from the baseline, and the data meets or exceeds the stakeholder suggested targets.

**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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2014 | 17.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% | 54.00% | 56.00% | 58.00% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| \*[[87]](#footnote-88)1 | 20 | 92.00% | 48.00% | \*[[88]](#footnote-89)1 | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

It is the 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, and it is calculated using the same methodology as is used for calculating Indicator B1, Graduation Rates.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

It is the 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. The analysis is the same as the calculation for Indicator 1 Graduation Rates, using the same formula as proposed for the FFY 2020 APR for indicator 1: 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 special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator. 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.

**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.**

As part of the SSIP, each school developed measurable goals and an action plan for change, including a Goal Attainment Scale (GAS) to determine the extent to which they are meeting their goals each year. All school goals are related to addressing areas that predict the SiMR (e.g., student attendance, reading/math proficiency, parent engagement). Schools are making progress towards their goals as indicated from data collected on the GAS.

**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)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

See the RMI SSIP Evaluation Plan on this address, and then select the "SSIP reports" link:   
  
https://pss.edu.mh/documents/special-education-documents/

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

As indicated, in the previous SSIP report, RMI is developing a system to better prepare its current and new special education teachers. Stakeholders met in July 2021 and discussed next steps in implementing the plan for professional development that was presented to the RMI leadership team and other offices within RMI in 2020 (i.e., office of personnel development, office of finance, minister of education), and across agencies (i.e., the College of Marshall Islands). The team developed a needs assessment to better gauge the specific PD needs of special education teachers and how to best adapt evidence-based practices in PD to meet the RMI’s specific context. Data collection is underway. This data will be used by the team to refine the professional development (PD) plan, leveraging existing resources within the RMI Public School System (special education, general education) and across agencies (e.g., College of Marshall Islands) to increase the knowledge and skills of special education teachers and improve the quality of instruction for students with disabilities ultimately leading to increased student learning and behavior outcomes and ultimately the SiMR.  
  
RMI PSS implemented the revised General Supervision monitoring procedures including agendas for each day of the visit and protocols for each the data collection effort to ensure procedural fidelity across teams implementing the monitoring across various schools. Evaluation data indicate these procedures are supporting schools in identifying potential root causes for not making progress towards their desired outcomes identified in their school-wide action plans and determining action steps needed. In addition, RMI PSS provided PD while onsite with schools during monitoring visits to address specific needs identified by schools (e.g., writing quality IEPs, developing work-based learning experiences). These strategies are included in the strands of the theory of Action.

**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.**

RMI PSS continues to follow the Plan, Do, Study, Act, Model (PDSA) to ensure the work we are doing is successful in achieving the outcomes we desire. We continue to employ a secondary education specialist to oversee the middle and high schools work around secondary transition. She is responsible for providing ongoing coaching and support to the school implementation teams as they carry out their respective school action plans. Because our evaluation data and stakeholders continue to identify coaching as a need, we continue to explore our capacity to deliver high quality coaching to teachers within our schools. In July 2021, we met with our SSIP extended core team and our leadership team to discuss options for leveraging existing opportunities on island that are preparing staff to be instructional coaches. As part of the PSS Strategic Plan (i.e., the 2021-2025 strategic plan for the Ministry of Education, Sport, and Training), there is an emphasis decreasing the gaps between where we are and where we want to be and goals around supporting the development of effective principals and teachers.

**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*.***

RMI PSS has engaged new stakeholders to support efforts in improving the quality of instruction. RMI PSS is strategically partnering with the College of the Marshall Islands to design and implement the PD plan. To help facilitate this collaboration, RMI PSS has named a project coordinator to oversee this work and help to facilitate the teams’ efforts. The team will leverage the new distance learning centers in several neighboring islands as PD dissemination sites. As part of the overall teacher retention plan, RMI PSS is also leveraging efforts to improve the quality of instruction that is occurring at the PSS level via the Quality of Basic Education project. The special education team is adapting some of the protocols that have been developed and tested with the larger education community in RMI regarding the implementation of the quality pedagogy framework that guides professional learning offered by RMI PSS.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

We are using the Implementation Stages Planning tool to help us examine our implementation efforts and make decisions (https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/resources/stages-implementation-analysis-where-are-we; NIRN, 2020). We have moved into initial implementation regarding our plan for changing the infrastructure for the way we deliver professional development and coaching. We have expanded our team to include the ministry of Finance, personnel development, the College of the Marshall Islands, among other stakeholders. We have conducted the research and have determined from the literature what the PD looks like (defining the practice). We are now collecting some additional data to determine how the research translates to our local context. For example, while online modules and face-to-face coaching from the transition specialist might work in Majuro, it will not in the neighboring islands. We will continue to refine the plan in initial implementation to reach all special education teachers.   
  
The Special Education team continues to conduct trainings on writing quality IEPs with the schools. These trainings have included special education teachers, general education teachers, and principals. Most trainings were conducted after school monitoring and focused on needs identified by the schools. Evaluation data collected after the training indicated the training was effective in increasing the knowledge of quality IEPs and participants found the training and materials relevant to their work. Participants requested ongoing feedback throughout the year to ensure they were meeting the requirements and best supporting the students they served. This evaluation data supports the plan to continue to investigate further improvements to the infrastructure to deliver high quality professional development to schools.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Co-planning and collaborative teaching; Explicit Instruction; Repeated Reading

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

The special education and general education teachers continue to co-plan each of the instructional lessons. In some cases, teachers have developed modified lesson plans for students with disabilities that include more scaffolding and additional supports. To promote reading and math proficiency, in addition to the previously implemented school-wide activities (e.g., reading comprehension, math drills), teachers have now been trained to implement Repeated Reading, a strategy identified by the What Works Clearinghouse to positively influence reading comprehension (this is in the initial stages of implementation). This practice was selected based on its feasibility to implement in schools as well as preliminary data indicating effectiveness with ELL learners (e.g., Chen, 2018; Landra & Barbetta, 2017; Yeganeh, 2013). Special education and general education teachers are working together to ensure each student with a disability receives the appropriate accommodations outlined in the IEP during all class.

**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.**

Previous research identifies indicators and predictors of students who persist through school and are ready for college and careers. Some of these indicators and predictors include attendance (students with attendance rates above 80% are more likely to graduate), grade point average (above a 3.0), Reading by 3rd grade, and passing ELA and math (College and Career Readiness Center, 2013). Each school has included in their school-wide action plans evidence-based strategies to address the indicators or predictors. For example, schools are implementing school-wide programs focused on improving attendance, including incentives for students to stay engaged and more focus on family engagement). All schools have a focus on improving reading due to the low scores on the MISAT. Teachers have been trained in Explicit Instruction and Repeated Reading; two strategies research has demonstrated have positive effects on reading outcomes. Teachers also continue to use collaborative teaching models to ensure they are able to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of each student in the class.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

We have gathered data using a rubric designed by the SSIP stakeholders to determine how well general teachers and sped teachers co-teach together and to what extent teachers are using the strategies they learned about via professional development (e.g., Repeated Reading, Collaborative Teaching, Explicit Instruction). The results of the observations indicate teachers’ scores ranged from 16-20 indicating effective teaching.

**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.**

In addition to graduation data and data on the MISAT, each school is collecting formative data on student outcomes to inform decisions regarding the continuation of effective practices. For example, MIHS is monitoring student attendance weekly and making adjustments based on student needs. MIMS is collecting data regarding reading and math performance via curriculum-based measures.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

RMI PSS plans to provide ongoing coaching to teachers implementing the evidence-based practices to improve quality of instruction as well as IEP development. Two protocols have been developed to guide coaching sessions to ensure fidelity across coaches. In addition to the RMI PSS staff, Principals are receiving training on how to coach.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

To solicit broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and possible subsequent revisions to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the RMI PSS engage a diverse group of stakeholders, at least twice a year (in January and in July of each year).   
  
For setting the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR, including indicator 17 (SSIP), the RMI PSS special education team convened stakeholders in a hybrid type series of meetings in January 2022. Three meetings were convened where stakeholders in Majuro and Kwajalein atolls were able to meet in person, and a link to a Zoom session was made available, where these two groups could connect with each other, and stakeholders and TA providers in other locations could join as well.  
  
The group of stakeholders for the three days included four parents, two of them being parents who are representatives of parent groups, a person with a disability, special education teachers, regular education teachers, principals and vice principals, leaders of disability groups, and PSS staff. In total, on Day 1 there were 24 stakeholders, on day 2, 26 stakeholders, and on day 3, 23 stakeholders. Days 1 and 2 were focused on the SPP/APR and the SSIP target setting activities for all results indicators.  
  
The RMI PSS team organized a Powerpoint presentation to guide the target setting process. The PPT included a refresher on what is the SPP/APR, what are all the special education indicators applicable to RMI schools, and the the target setting process for results indicators. All stakeholders were able to review the data for each indicator, with historic trends for indicators where this was possible to be made, and a projected trajectory based on a rigorous yet achievable target in FFY 2025, that was always larger than the baseline.

Specifically for the SSIP (Indicator B17), since the SIMR is the same measurement and data as the Graduation Rate (Indicator B1), stakeholders discussed targets for B1 and B17 together. Their proposal was to continue the data trends and continue having B17 have the same targets as B1.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Stakeholders in the Republic of the Marshall Islands serve a fundamental role in the development, implementation, and ongoing evaluation of the RMI Public School System (PSS) SSIP. Stakeholders provide feedback on measures, work on data collection activities, disseminate findings to the general public, and are part of the implementation team. Stakeholders are informed on the SSIP progress via online publication of the SSIP and via meetings. Stakeholders network with the SSIP core team, meeting twice a year with the implementation teams. Stakeholders collaborate with the SSIP team, participating on the SSIP Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA), helping evaluate, planning the implementation of SSIP activities. The stakeholders play a transforming role, they co-developed the school improvement plans, they work with the core team on the implementation of these plans. Below are examples of stakeholder engagement.  
  
Stakeholders (middle and high school teachers, principals, representatives from the College of Marshall Islands, parent groups, Special Education Advisory Council) remain on the SSIP team for implementation, partnering with high schools and community agencies to evaluate efforts of the SSIP. These stakeholders provided input into the design and development of the evaluation and have ensured the RMI PSS continues to (a) ask the right evaluation questions, (b) collect sufficient data to answer the evaluation questions, (c) analyze the data appropriately, and (d) use the data for secondary transition program improvement.   
  
In July 2021 we convened stakeholders to (a) update stakeholders on SSIP implementation and outcomes identified in the previous reporting period, and (b) reaffirm SSIP plan (including activities, evaluation, and responsibilities). Stakeholders began the meeting celebrating outcomes achieved during the last year of implementation of the SSIP, including continuing to surpass the SiMR target, despite a reduction in the percent of youth with disabilities graduating with a high school diploma.   
  
As we moved into our sixth PDSA cycle, stakeholders supported PSS in building capacity to deliver quality PD and coaching needed to support teachers in sustained implementation of evidence-based practices in schools. We continued to engage all stakeholders in the implementation and evaluation of the face-to-face meetings or online via Zoom. Stakeholders continued to reiterate the need for ongoing communication and training regarding transition topics to support their work in schools and insisted it be included as an ongoing activity in the SSIP.   
  
In July 2021 and in January 2022, the Core team met with the Special Education Advisory Group to confirm roles and responsibilities in relation to collecting evaluation data. Several stakeholders are responsible for collecting data for this SSIP evaluation. Our principals included in the extended core team are responsible for ensuring the implementation of the school improvement plans, the accurate collection of attendance data and fidelity data as teachers begin implementing some evidence-based practices in which they have been trained. MIDPO, WUTMI, and the LDAH (parents and PTI groups), collected data on parent participation in parent workshops as well as parent knowledge and parent satisfaction data. They summarized these data and provided to the team to inform future plans.   
  
The Special Education Advisory group reviewed and analyzed all evaluation data to date and determined no additional changes were need to the evaluation and SSIP implementation at this time. They also used the data to set more rigorous targets for the upcoming APR cycle.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

**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.**

All activities were already described in previous sessions.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

Not applicable.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

Not applicable.

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

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

The RMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets

## 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:**

Frank Horiuchi

**Title:**

Special Education Director

**Email:**

fhoriuchi@pss.edu.mh

**Phone:**

(692) 625-3656

**Submitted on:**

04/28/22 6:08:44 PM
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