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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2019. 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.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.  
  
RMI's FFY 2019 APR includes performance for the above indicators with explanation of slippage where applicable. Indicator 17, RMI's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), with SSIP Phase III, Year Five performance will be submitted by April 1, 2021.  
  
RMI has reviewed the results of this report and will address areas of concern.  
  
RMI appreciates OSEP's support through its Differentiated Monitoring and Support System (DMS) 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 (NTACT), RMI intends to continue to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

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

Aside from indicator 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 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. 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.  
  
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  
  
 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 the Special Ed Information Management System (SEIMS);  
PSS program assessment through self-evaluation and improvement planning (Integrated and Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring Procedures and the State Systemic Improvement Plan - SSIP) involving the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC);   
Annual review and compliance determination;   
Triennial (every 3 years) on-site monitoring;   
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 a special education specialist from the Special Education Office assigned to a school. The assigned specialist maintains 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 5 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), Attachment A to the RMI PSS Special Education Policies and Procedures. The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) also includes an important technical assistance component.  
  
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 students 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.  
  
The RMI PSS has also maintained a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Plan for system requirements of special education teachers; school administrators; related services personnel; and MOE staff.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

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

YES

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

The RMI/PSS website at https://www.pss.edu.mh/ns/documents/ became functional in June 2015, and is now accessible to and from all atolls, schools, and communities. Please scroll down to a link for “special education documents” and click on “download” to access the documents. Or follow this other link https://www.pss.edu.mh/ns/documents/reports/ and scroll down to go directly to the special education documents. Within the special education documents section, please scroll down to “special education program documents” to locate the FFY 2018 APR.   
  
Please note that the Marshall Islands is a single district entity. The SEA and the LEA are the same entity. Therefore, the SPP/APR describes the performance of the LEA and the State with respect to its targets APR and it was reported no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). On this same link, visitors will locate previous APRs.  
  
Please also note that the RMI PSS also reported on its FFY 2018 performance to and through schools to communities and by government radio and the Marshall Islands Journal.   
  
The FFY 2019 APR will be on the PSS website, on the same location no later than 120 days following the state’s submission. Because internet can be unstable in the Marshall Islands, the APR information will be provided to the public via other media formats such as via government radio and the Marshall Islands Journal (main newspaper in the Marshall Islands) and paper copies will be provided to schools.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, RMI must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, RMI must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, RMI must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the RMI's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - 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.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 37.00% | 38.00% | 40.00% | 42.00% | 44.00% |
| Data | 37.50% | 33.33% | 46.15% | 25.00% | 80.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 46.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | 25 |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 27 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 92.59% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 25 | 27 | 80.00% | 46.00% | 92.59% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

Other

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain*.***

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)**

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (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:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

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.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.28% | 0.92% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

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

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 23 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 2 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 0 |

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

YES

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

RMI uses Option 2 to calculate its dropout rate. It is the dropout rate definition from its FFY 2010 APR, submitted on February 2012. It is calculated by dividing the number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out (file C009) by the total number of youth with IEP (14-21) as measured by the child count (file C002) of the same school year as file C009. In this case, School Year 2018-19.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | **FFY** **2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 25 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**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 below.**

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

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 30.00% | 35.00% | 40.00% | 45.00% | 50.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 27.80% | Actual | 32.93% | 21.36% | 82.84% | 89.94% | 92.81% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 30.00% | 35.00% | 40.00% | 45.00% | 50.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 27.80% | Actual | 32.93% | 21.36% | 82.84% | 89.94% | 92.09% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 92.81% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 92.09% | 95.00% |  | 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.**

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

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

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.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 12.00% | 14.00% | 16.00% | 18.00% | 20.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 5.70% | Actual | 5.56% | 15.28% | 16.22% | 23.78% | 8.53% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 12.00% | 14.00% | 16.00% | 18.00% | 20.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 5.70% | Actual | 8.33% | 15.28% | 14.41% | 20.98% | 6.25% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 20.00% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 20.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 8.53% | 20.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 6.25% | 20.00% |  | 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.**

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

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

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.

## 3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of districts in the State** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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 2019 Calculation  
The suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities in RMI/PSS, using SY 2018-19 data from Section 618 File C005 as submitted on November of 2019, indicates zero students with disabilities were suspended. As such, no further analysis was required. Therefore, in RMI/PSS, in FFY 2019, 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 2019 using 2018-2019 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)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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:**

RMI PSS student population is comprised of a single race-ethnicity, therefore this analysis is not applicable.

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable for the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs 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**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| A | 72.80% | Data | 95.73% | 83.85% | 73.24% | 72.46% | 74.58% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 10.00% |
| B | 26.20% | Data | 0.00% | 0.26% | 0.16% | 0.00% | 0.17% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 0.95% |
| C | 1.00% | Data | 1.14% | 0.65% | 0.47% | 0.34% | 0.51% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 85.00% |
| Target B <= | 5.00% |
| Target C <= | 0.95% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 620 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 483 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 5 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 6 |

**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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 483 | 620 | 74.58% | 85.00% | 77.90% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 5 | 620 | 0.17% | 5.00% | 0.81% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 6 | 620 | 0.51% | 0.95% | 0.97% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **C** | Last year RMI had three students in this setting. This year RMI has six students in this setting. The reason for slippage are three new students with DB, MD, and OI disabilities that require, per their IEP teams decision, to be in settings which were deemed appropriate for their disabilities in SY 2019-20. |

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

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(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**

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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 aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

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

**Instructions**

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

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.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 96.00% |
| A | 95.00% | Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 97.44% | 96.00% | 100.00% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 4.00% |
| B | 5.00% | Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.56% | 4.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 96.00% |
| Target B <= | 4.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 25 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | 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 | 14 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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 | 14 | 25 | 100.00% | 96.00% | 56.00% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 0 | 25 | 0.00% | 4.00% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | 11 students received services in other locations (separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) based on their IEP team decisions. Of these 11 students, seven are visually impaired or hearing impaired students. Of the remaining four, one student was temporarily receiving services at home, at the time of the child count data, and the student is currently receiving services on the regular location for the majority of the time. The other three students are autistic and multiple disabilities students. |

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2018 | Target >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 100.00% |
| A1 | 37.50% | Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 81.82% | 37.50% |
| A2 | 2018 | Target >= | 40.00% | 40.00% | 42.00% | 44.00% | 76.00% |
| A2 | 12.50% | Data | 25.00% | 72.73% | 85.71% | 78.95% | 12.50% |
| B1 | 2018 | Target >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 100.00% |
| B1 | 25.00% | Data | 90.00% | 80.00% | 90.00% | 100.00% | 25.00% |
| B2 | 2018 | Target >= | 30.00% | 30.00% | 32.00% | 34.00% | 36.00% |
| B2 | 12.50% | Data | 15.00% | 72.73% | 76.19% | 84.21% | 12.50% |
| C1 | 2018 | Target >= | 80.00% | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 100.00% |
| C1 | 62.50% | Data | 95.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 62.50% |
| C2 | 2018 | Target >= | 20.00% | 20.00% | 22.00% | 24.00% | 26.00% |
| C2 | 37.50% | Data | 40.00% | 63.64% | 100.00% | 94.74% | 37.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 40.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 15.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 27.50% |
| Target B2 >= | 15.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 65.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 40.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

11

**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 | 4 | 36.36% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 3 | 27.27% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 36.36% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)* | 7 | 11 | 37.50% | 40.00% | 63.64% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 4 | 11 | 12.50% | 15.00% | 36.36% | 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 | 3 | 27.27% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 6 | 54.55% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 18.18% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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)* | 8 | 11 | 25.00% | 27.50% | 72.73% | 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)* | 2 | 11 | 12.50% | 15.00% | 18.18% | 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 | 2 | 18.18% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 7 | 63.64% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 18.18% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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 | 11 | 62.50% | 65.00% | 81.82% | 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)* | 2 | 11 | 37.50% | 40.00% | 18.18% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **C2** | RMI met five of the six targets for this indicator. A small group of students was having progress toward meeting this target, and likely would be functioning within age expectations should they stayed longer in the program. RMI staff continues to improve service delivery so that the group of students ages 3-5 receiving services can meet all targets and show improvements on their pre-school outcomes. |

**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)**

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.50% |
| Data | 92.71% | 91.89% | 93.75% | 91.94% | 94.12% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 95.00% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 106 | | 114 | 94.12% | 95.00% | 92.98% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

114

**Percentage of respondent parents**

100.00%

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The reasons for slippage cannot be explained by comparing these two data sets from FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. As explained in the FFY 2018 APR report, the parent survey data was not representative of all RMI region, because data was not collected from the neighboring islands due to the Dengue Fever outbreak, resulting in low response rate. This year, RMI was no longer impacted by the Dengue Fever, and RMI remained COVID-19 free. Therefore, RMI staff was able to travel and collect Parent Survey data from the neighboring islands. Although data shows slippage, the FFY 2019 data is representative of the demographics, students, and regions of RMI.

**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 2019 APR is representative of the two 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 |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | YES |

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

In RMI 100% of the students are Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders, therefore, the response group was representative of the student race-ethnicity. RMI staff calculated data representativeness also based on the disability groups when the number of students allowed for this analysis. Findings indicated that groups were representative based on learning disabilities and all other disabilities. Because RMI was no longer impacted by the Dengue Fever, and RMI remained COVID-19 free. RMI staff was able to travel and collect Parent Survey data from the neighboring islands, making the FFY 2019 data also representative of the regions of RMI.

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

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the Republic of the Marshall Islands must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the Republic of the Marshall Islands is taking to address this issue. The Republic of the Marshall Islands must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

In RMI 100% of the students are Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders, therefore, the response group was representative of the student race-ethnicity. RMI staff calculated data representativeness also based on the disability groups when the number of students allowed for this analysis. Findings indicated that groups were representative based on learning disabilities and all other disabilities. Because RMI was no longer impacted by the Dengue Fever, and RMI remained COVID-19 free, RMI staff was able to travel and collect Parent Survey data from the neighboring islands, making the FFY 2019 data also representative of the regions of RMI.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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.**

RMI PSS student population is comprised of a single race-ethnicity, therefore this analysis is not applicable.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable for the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

## 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 2019, 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 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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**

RMI PSS student population is comprised of a single race-ethnicity, therefore this analysis is not applicable.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable for the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

## 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 64 | 64 | 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 Educaption 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)**

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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.

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.

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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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.**

RMI does not implement an IDEA Part C program, therefore this indicator is not applicable.

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable for the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

## 12 - Required Actions

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Secondary transition: 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 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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 55 | 55 | 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=55) 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)**

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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, 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.

*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***

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.

**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 analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and 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.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 10.00% | 10.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% |
| A | 0.00% | Data | 0.00% | 18.18% | 21.43% | 12.50% | 30.00% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 10.00% | 10.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% |
| B | 0.00% | Data | 0.00% | 45.45% | 57.14% | 50.00% | 60.00% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 60.00% | 70.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| C | 0.00% | Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 15.00% |
| Target B >= | 15.00% |
| Target C >= | 75.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 25 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 5 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 11 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 0 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 9 |

| **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 5 | 25 | 30.00% | 15.00% | 20.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 16 | 25 | 60.00% | 15.00% | 64.00% | 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) | 25 | 25 | 100.00% | 75.00% | 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.

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

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

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

**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.**

25 of the 25 students who exited PSS in SY 2018-19 were contacted. 100% of their responses were received about their status after leaving school, 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 25 students (100%) who exited in SY 2018-19 responded to the interview. That is, it is 100% representative based on gender, race, and the disability of the exiting population.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? | YES |

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

Aside from indicators 3B and 3C, because RMI PSS did not implement its statewide assessments due to COVID-19, all other indicators' data were not impacted by the pandemic. All data reported on the FFY 2019 SPP/APR are complete, valid and reliable.  
  
PLEASE NOTE: The algorithm of the APR tool does not indicate slippage for all B14 items. However, in comparing FFY 2019 data to the previous year's data we identified slippage for B14 item A. There were fewer students enrolled in higher education in FFY 2019. In discussing this with the local college leadership, they informed us that enrollment was lower overall for the college. In particular, they mentioned they haven't recruited aggressively this year. However, as part of the college strategic plan, they formed new partnerships with the schools to create a pipeline from schools to college, which would include students with disabilities.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 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, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 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**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

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, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The Republic of the Marshall Islands reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The Republic of the Marshall Islands 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 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**

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) has been and will continue to be the primary means of stakeholder involvement related to special education and to the State Performance Plan (SPP) Annual Performance Report (APR), State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and to targets in the SPP. Other stakeholder groups include and have included special education parent groups on Majuro and on Ebeye, the two most populous atolls in the Marshall Islands, and a recently established SSIP Expanded Core Team of public and private school educators, parents, and other agency representatives.  
  
The SEAC Is the PSS's advisory panel for the purpose of providing advice and guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its implementing federal regulations at 34 CFR §§300.167-169.  
  
The advisory panel pursuant to CFR §§300.167-169 performs the following duties and functions:  
  
 Advise the PSS of unmet needs within the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) in the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by RMI regarding the education of children with disabilities;?  
 Advise the PSS in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the U.S. Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA;  
 Advise the PSS in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in monitoring reports under Part B of IDEA; and  
 Advise the PSS in developing and implementing policies related to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.  
  
Marshall Islands plans and reports are developed by the PSS staff with input and involvement of the SEAC.  
  
The SEAC is comprised of majority parents and individuals with disabilities; teachers; school and MOEST (Ministry of Education, Sport and Training) officials; public health, mental health, judiciary, community college, and other agency personnel; and community representatives appointed by the Minister of Education. The APR is available for review at schools and on the PSS website; and the information in the document is disseminated through the government radio, in the Marshall Islands Journal, and at school meetings.  
  
With input from stakeholders, RMI identified in FFY 2013 SPP targets for Indicators 1 to 8, and 14 for FFY 2014 to FFY 2018. Because of the one-year extension of the SPP, RMI gathered input from stakeholders on January 28, 2020 to determine targets for these indicators for the FFY 2019 APR. Indicators B11 and B13, which are compliance indicators, have targets set by OSEP at 100%. RMI has not set targets for Indicators 15 and 16 because there has been no meditations or hearing requests. Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 were determined by OSEP as not applicable to RMI. The stakeholders will be convened in 2021 to set targets for FFY 2020-2025 for the indicators where setting targets is appropriate.

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, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The Republic of the Marshall Islands reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The Republic of the Marshall Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - 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:**

04/29/21 1:30:37 PM

# ED Attachments

  