

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2019**

**Guam**



**PART B DUE  
February 1, 2021**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of Guam's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2019. A description of Guam's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR and how Guam will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of Guam's FFY 2019 APR.

In FFY 2013, Guam stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. As per OSEP's instruction, with stakeholder input, Guam included FFY 2019 targets for Results Indicators in its FFY 2018 APR. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. As per OSEP's instructions, Indicators 4B, 9, and 10 do not apply to Guam. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, Guam reports FFY 2019 data to determine if Guam met its FFY 2019 target, an explanation of slippage if Guam did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination Letter for Guam's FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

As required for Indicator 17, Guam's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), Guam will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year 5 no later than April 1, 2021.

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

In relevant FFY 2019 APR indicators, information is provided on the data collection and reporting impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted school operations beginning March 16, 2020 when the Governor of Guam declared a public health emergency and schools were required to close for the health and safety of all Guam residents. The Guam Department of Education (GDOE) offered distance learning opportunities for students, including students with disabilities. The distance learning opportunities were either online learning or through a hard copy packet curriculum distribution. Limited face-to-face instruction was offered beginning January 19, 2021 as the Governor of Guam eased restrictions for opening schools. However, the face-to-face limitation was due to the continued public health restrictions to mitigate the spread of the coronavirus. Guam continues to require social distancing and wearing of face masks, which have impacted how schools are able to hold face-to-face instruction.

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

1

#### General Supervision System

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

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

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

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

#### Technical Assistance System

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

On September 23, 2014, the Guam Education Board (GEB) approved the GDOE State Strategic Plan, "20/20: A Clear Vision for Education on Guam." The State Strategic Plan's focus is not just on the implementation of reform programs, but also to invest in the long-term capacity building of Department personnel by providing training and resources on research-proven Curriculum-Instruction-Assessment strategies and effective school structures. School Administrators, teachers and instructional personnel are presented with the research, trained on specific strategies to implement research findings, and are provided opportunities to implement and refine their skills through regular reflection and collaboration with peers.

This technical assistance system and mechanism ensures the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support provided to schools. GDOE has implemented several school level systems-wide initiatives that are intended to improve results for all students such as Classroom Instruction That Works (CITW), to include instructional foundations, CITW with Technology and CITW with English Learners, Understanding by Design, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Systems and literacy strategies to support the FFY 2018 Part B SPP/APR implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Literacy Across the Curriculum. School Principals are also required to conduct Power Walk Throughs for each teacher several times per year.

As part of the GDOE State Strategic Plan, there is a conceptual framework for instructional leadership and school level leadership inclusive of school cadre teams who serve as resources in their respective schools, to include providing information on CCSS and other available resources. Additionally,

using the standards of professional learning, each school has a collaborative learning team. These collaborative learning teams use the premise of Curriculum-Instruction-Assessment-Interventions which uses data to drive decisions to improve outcomes for all students. Moreover, the GDOE has implemented a Teacher and Principal evaluation system to allow for a systemic way for GDOE to identify areas of strengths and opportunities for improvement as a means to improve student performance on all state-level assessments.

Guam Part B also has a technical assistance delivery system that includes on-site technical assistance, training and support to school teams responsible for delivering services to students with disabilities and personnel from the Division, such as related services personnel, transition teachers, and consulting resource teachers-technical assistance (CRTs-TA). The technical assistance, training and support provided is based on the level of support needed by the school teams and Division personnel.

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

Furthermore, Guam Part B received technical assistance and support for the development of Guam's FFY 2019 SPP/APR through OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources such as the DaSY Center, IDC, ECTA, NTACTION, WINTAC, NCSI, NCEO, and the EDFacts Partner Support Center for the required IDEA 618 data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts, and through Guam CEDDERS.

### **Professional Development System**

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

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

With GDOE's mission statement: "Every student: responsible, respectful, and ready for life," several goals were developed to improve educational outcomes for all students. One such goal is that GDOE instructional personnel will meet high standards for qualifications and ongoing professional development and will be held accountable for all assigned responsibilities. There are a total of eight (8) professional development days in the GDOE School Calendar: all eight (8) days are Full-Day professional days and are designated specifically for the state-wide initiatives.

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

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

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

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

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School

Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

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

**Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, Guam must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, Guam must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, Guam must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 5; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since Guam'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.

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In Guam's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

Guam must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

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

As required for Indicator 17, Guam's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), Guam will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year 5 no later than April 1, 2021, which will include data and information to address Guam's Part B SSIP State-Identified Measurable Results (SiMR).

Guam's determination for 2020 reported a score of zero for the "long standing noncompliance" indicator in the compliance matrix for Guam's Part B grant special condition and uncorrected identified noncompliance. Guam, therefore, provides the following information related to the technical assistance received and actions taken related to Guam's Part B grant special condition:

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

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

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

In October 2019, with support from OSEP, Guam hosted the Pacific SSIP Collaborative convening on Guam with teams from the six Pacific entities. Facilitated by four OSEP-funded centers: NCEO, NCSI, NCII, and NCIL and two regional technical assistance organizations: Regional Educational Laboratory-Pacific and University of Guam CEDDERS, the six-day regional event focused on building each entity's capacity to increase reading achievement of students with disabilities within a multi-tiered system of supports. As a result, NCSI continued to provide follow-up Pacific SSIP virtual sessions to support entity-specific needs in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as to address each entity's technical assistance needs related to their SSIP-specific priorities.

**Intro - OSEP Response**

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on Guam's FFY 2020 IDEA Part B grant award and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the determination.

Guam's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed Guam that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance. Guam provided the required information.

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, Guam does not have any FFY 2019 data for indicator 17.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Guam did not provide any data for Indicator 17. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2020 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

OSEP notes that Guam submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in Guam's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, Guam 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
2008	65.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%
Data	80.17%	82.52%	90.76%	85.42%	85.81%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	86.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### 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	145
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	174
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	83.33%

#### 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
145	174	85.81%	86.00%	83.33%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Guam did not meet its target of 86% for Indicator 1 and did not show improvement from the previous year by 2.48% from 85.81% (127/148) in FFY 2018 to 83.33% (145/174) in FFY 2019. By numbers, the FFY 2019 data however showed an increase in the number of youth with an IEP graduating with a high school diploma from 127 in FFY 2018 to 145 in FFY 2019; an increase of 18 youth with an IEP graduating with a high school diploma.

Although there was an increase in the number of youth with IEPs graduating with a high school diploma, Guam reported slippage due to the increase in the number of youth with IEPs in the FFY 2019 adjusted cohort eligible to graduate represented in the denominator. For FFY 2019, the number of youth with IEPs in the adjusted cohort was 174, whereas, for FFY 2018, the number of youth with IEPs in the adjusted cohort was 148, which was an increase of 26 youth with IEPs who were eligible to graduate from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019.

A consideration for the increase in eligible youth with IEPs is the change in Guam's law governing the age for compulsory education. Guam Public Law 34-104 was signed and in effect on June 5, 2018, and thereby raised the relative age from sixteen (16) to eighteen (18) years old in reference to the duty to send children to school.

This law could have contributed to the slippage in Indicator 1 with the increase in the number of youth with IEPs in the FFY 2019 adjusted cohort eligible to graduate represented in the denominator. The change in the compulsory age that required students to stay in school until age 18 was effective at the end of school year 2017-2018 and throughout school year 2018-2019, which were within the timeframe of this FFY 2019 adjusted cohort.

To address the Indicator 1 slippage, Guam will continue to work with school personnel in the high schools, along with students with IEPs, to ensure that measures, interventions, and strategies are in place so that students with IEPs could meet the credit requirements of their classes in order to graduate with their cohorts.

#### 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.**

As an outlying area, Guam does not report graduation data to the Department under ESEA Title 1. Guam uses GDOE's cohort formula for calculating annual graduation rates. This equates to the following:

Total number of graduates, inclusive of Summer 2019 Graduates = 145

Total number of graduates, inclusive of the Summer 2019 graduates + (dropouts for 12th Grade in SY 2018-2019) + (dropouts for 11th Grade in SY 2017-2018) + (dropouts for 10th Grade in SY 2016-2015) + (dropouts for 9th Grade in SY 2015-2016) = 174

$145/174 \times 100 = 83.33\%$

Data for computing SY2018-2019 was extracted from the Guam Part B 618 Table 4 Exit Report for July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, and from the Division of Special Education's archived database. Since Guam Part B mirrors the methodology employed by GDOE for calculating the cohort rate for determining graduation rate, data collected for students graduating for school year 2018-2019 includes graduates from Summer 2019. It should therefore be noted that this reflection may differ from the 618 Exit report which reports for periods July 1st to June 30th.

GDOE Board Policy #351.4 (11/27/00) states that a graduate must have a minimum of 24 credits for a high school diploma from a Guam public high school. The Exiting section of the Handbook for the Delivery of Special Education Services states that graduates are students who meet the same standards for graduation as students without disabilities.

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

NO

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

### **1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **1 - OSEP Response**

### **1 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs 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
2008	1.20%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	4.00%	3.75%	3.50%	3.25%	1.19%
Data	2.79%	1.97%	3.24%	3.62%	3.58%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	1.15%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

**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)	145
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)	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 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)	19
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)	3

**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**

Based on the Part B Indicator Measurement for the FFY 2019 submission, Guam has chosen to utilize the same data source and measurement used in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR for this FFY 2019 Indicator 2 reporting period. The data reported are, therefore, based on the FFY 2010 APR Indicator 2 measurement guidance.

As an outlying area, Guam does not report drop out data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation to the Department under ESEA Title 1. Guam uses the number of dropouts in the 618 exit data (EDFacts File C009) and the high school enrollment for students with IEPs for calculating annual drop out rates for students with IEPs. Per OSEP's instructions, for FFY 2019, Guam will report FFY 2018 data (SY2018-2019).

FFY 2019 data for Indicator 2 was calculated by dividing the number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out (19) with the number of youth with IEPs in the 9th through 12th Grade (759). This calculation equates to  $19/759 \times 100 = 2.50\%$ , which is the data being reported for Indicator 2 for FFY 2019.

**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 in 9th-12th Grade	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
19	759	3.58%	1.15%	2.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

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

GDOE Board Policy 375: Definition of Dropout states the following:

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

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

NO

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

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

## 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 >=	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.00%
A	Overall	83.00%	Actual	86.25%	95.93%	96.12%	94.87%	94.76%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.00%
A	Overall	85.00%	Actual	88.96%	95.83%	95.58%	95.54%	95.65%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	96.50%
Math	A >=	Overall	96.50%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

COVID-19 Pandemic Impact: Due to school closures, Guam did not administer any district-wide assessments in Spring 2020. Nationally, all schools received a waiver from the USDOE for the administration of state-wide assessments in Spring 2020.

#### FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

NO

#### 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											

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
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			94.76%	96.50%		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			95.65%	96.50%		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, Guam 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 =  $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards}) / (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned})]$ . 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 >=	2.50%	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%
A	Overall	3.13%	Actual	2.85%	3.36%	14.27%	2.80%	2.92%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	2.50%	4.00%	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%
A	Overall	2.90%	Actual	2.96%	3.95%	12.75%	3.58%	3.72%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	10.50%
Math	A >=	Overall	10.50%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed

with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

COVID-19 Pandemic Impact: Due to school closures, Guam did not administer any district-wide assessments in Spring 2020. Nationally, all schools received a waiver from the USDOE for the administration of state-wide assessments in Spring 2020.

#### FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

NO

#### 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											



Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
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			2.92%	10.50%		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			3.72%	10.50%		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, Guam 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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$ .

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
2009	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

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### 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

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

#### METHODOLOGY

The enrollment data for students with disabilities on September 30th for SY 2018-2019 was 1831 students. The enrollment data for students without disabilities for SY2018-2019 was 27,288.

In SY 2018-2019, the number of long-term suspensions or expulsions for students with disabilities was 90 students based on the IDEA 618 discipline reported data; the number of long term suspensions or expulsions for students without disabilities was 2098 based on the GDOE student data system.

For this reporting year and using SY 2018-2019 data described above, 4.92% (90/1831) of students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days. For students without disabilities, 7.69% (2098/27,288) were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days.

Using Guam's definition of "significant discrepancy" whereby significant discrepancy is determined when children with disabilities have long term suspension and expulsion at a rate three times that of children without disabilities, children with disabilities were suspended or expelled at 4.92%, as opposed to 7.69% of children without disabilities. This indicates that children with disabilities were suspended 2.77% less than children without disabilities. This difference also does not reach the threshold of three times more than children without disabilities definition for significant discrepancy, which long-term suspension/expulsion data for children with disabilities would have had to be 23.07% (7.69% x 3).

**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.**

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

For FFY 2019, Guam did not report a "significant discrepancy." Thus, for FFY 2019, Guam did not identify any noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR Section 300.170(b).

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 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:

As per OSEP's instructions, this Indicator is not applicable to Guam.

### 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 4B - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to Guam.

### 4B- Required Actions

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 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	2017	Target >=	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%		44.50%
A	44.21%	Data	45.06%	46.88%	45.47%	44.21%	44.72%
B	2017	Target <=	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%		3.50%
B	3.79%	Data	8.09%	6.02%	4.89%	3.79%	2.75%
C	2017	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%		0.10%
C	0.11%	Data	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	0.11%	0.17%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	44.55%
Target B <=	3.45%
Target C <=	0.09%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed

with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### 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	1,706
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	704
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	47
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	2

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	704	1,706	44.72%	44.55%	41.27%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	47	1,706	2.75%	3.45%	2.75%	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]	2	1,706	0.17%	0.09%	0.12%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO



Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>Guam did not meet its target of 44.55% for Indicator 5A and did not show improvement from the previous year by 3.45% from 44.72% in FFY 2018 to 41.27% in FFY 2019. By numbers, in FFY 2018, there were 796 children ages 6-21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day, and in FFY 2019, there were 704 children ages 6-21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; a decrease by 92 children with an IEP from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019.</p> <p>It is understood that the determination of where school-age children with an IEP receive their special education services is an IEP team decision based on the individual needs of each child with an IEP. The reason for the decrease in the number of school-age children with an IEP in the regular class for 80% or more of the day was due to the IEP team determination based on the individual needs of the school-age children with an IEP. This individual IEP determination increased the number of children with an IEP within the 40-79% inside the regular class LRE category.</p> <p>The Division of Special Education continues to facilitate training sessions with teachers on accommodations and instructional strategies. The focus for the sessions has shifted to supporting teachers in distance learning strategies.</p>

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** 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 >=	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%
A	64.25%	Data	50.88%	54.72%	61.21%	63.47%	52.35%
B	2011	Target <=	11.00%	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%	9.00%
B	10.61%	Data	11.11%	11.32%	13.94%	5.39%	11.41%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	66.50%
Target B <=	8.50%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on

performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### 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	148
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	90
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	30
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	90	148	52.35%	66.50%	60.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	30	148	11.41%	8.50%	20.27%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	<p>Guam did not meet its target of 8.50% for Indicator 6B and did not show improvement from the previous year by 8.86% from 11.41% in FFY 2018 to 20.27% in FFY 2019. By numbers, in FFY 2018, there were 17 preschoolers with an IEP in special education preschool classrooms, and in FFY 2019, 30 preschoolers with an IEP were in special education preschool classrooms; an increase of 13 preschoolers with an IEP from FFY 2018 to FFY 2019.</p> <p>It is understood that the determination of where preschoolers with an IEP receive their special education services is an IEP team decision based on the individual needs of each preschooler with an IEP. The increase in the number of preschoolers with an IEP who required special education services provided in special education preschool classrooms was due to the IEP team determination based on the individual needs of the preschoolers with an IEP.</p> <p>The Division of Special Education Preschool Coordinator is a member of the GDOE Early Childhood Education Leadership Team. The Team provides recommendations to the Superintendent on programs and services for preschoolers. The Team is currently reviewing</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	eligibility criteria for Pre-KG classrooms. GDOE efforts include discussion of opportunities for preschoolers with disabilities to enroll in Pre-KG or Head Start classrooms.

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	2008	Target >=	84.78%	85.00%	85.00%	85.50%	85.50%
A1	71.00%	Data	65.08%	74.14%	76.92%	70.18%	83.58%
A2	2008	Target >=	29.79%	39.00%	39.00%	57.50%	57.51%

A2	57.50%	Data	35.71%	31.67%	21.21%	29.51%	23.53%
B1	2008	Target >=	85.11%	85.50%	85.50%	86.00%	86.00%
B1	80.00%	Data	73.13%	79.31%	80.00%	75.00%	88.24%
B2	2008	Target >=	23.40%	34.00%	34.00%	47.50%	47.51%
B2	47.50%	Data	24.29%	30.00%	16.67%	27.87%	20.59%
C1	2008	Target >=	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	89.31%	89.32%
C1	89.30%	Data	69.70%	79.31%	75.00%	59.65%	80.60%
C2	2008	Target >=	36.71%	40.00%	40.00%	70.00%	70.01%
C2	70.00%	Data	38.57%	40.00%	30.30%	32.79%	25.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	85.50%
Target A2 >=	57.51%
Target B1 >=	86.00%
Target B2 >=	47.51%
Target C1 >=	89.32%
Target C2 >=	70.01%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

58

##### 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	1	1.72%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	11	18.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	37	63.79%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9	15.52%
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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	46	58	83.58%	85.50%	79.31%	Did Not Meet Target	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	9	58	23.53%	57.51%	15.52%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1	1.72%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	13	22.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	36	62.07%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	13.79%
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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	44	58	88.24%	86.00%	75.86%	Did Not Meet Target	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	8	58	20.59%	47.51%	13.79%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

**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	1	1.72%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	11	18.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	34	58.62%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	11	18.97%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	1.72%

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. <i>Calculation: <math>(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</math></i>	45	57	80.60%	89.32%	78.95%	Did Not Meet Target	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. <i>Calculation: <math>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</math></i>	12	58	25.00%	70.01%	20.69%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>Guam did not meet its target of 85.50% for Indicator 7A1 for this reporting period. Guam's performance for this year was 79.31% (46/58), representing slippage of 4.27% in comparison to the FFY 2018 performance of 83.58%. Of the 58 preschoolers with IEPs that participated in this measurement, 37 or 63.79% of the preschoolers were in category "c" and 9 or 15.52% preschoolers were in category "d" for a total of 46 preschoolers who substantially increased in their rate of growth in positive social emotional skills.</p> <p>The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the 11 or 18.97% of preschoolers in category "b" who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers in positive social emotional skills. The following data points were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Age at Entry</li> <li>-Length of service</li> <li>-Disability</li> <li>-Setting Data</li> </ul> <p>Based on the data drill down, five out of the 11 preschoolers were three years of age and six preschoolers were four years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education (ECSE) services.</p> <p>The following data points were analyzed:</p> <p>Length of services. Four (4) of the 11 preschoolers received less than 23 months of services and 7 preschoolers received more than 24 months of services.</p> <p>Disability. Five (5) of the 11 were identified as developmental delay; 5 preschoolers were identified as having autism; and one preschooler was eligible as multiple disabilities.</p> <p>Settings/ Placement. Seven (7) of the preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; 1 preschooler was in the ECSE classroom; 1 in a typical preschool setting; and 2 received services in the home.</p>



Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:</p> <p>There are children with specific conditions such as autism, that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports. The Program discussed the importance of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) strategy that are used for preschoolers with disabilities and not just for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Furthermore, the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM), is an evidence-based intervention that is being implemented for children accessing early childhood special education services.</p> <p>Stakeholders indicated the social aspect, especially for children with ASD, is important to start early in accessing ECSE services to build social-emotional skills. Stakeholders also discussed in great detail the need to work with families to recognize the need of their child early on and not “wait” for their child to catch up developmentally. The Program will begin to address strategies to support families by using the early childhood coaching model as a strategy to support parents and to provide specific parental training using the ESDM Parent coaching modules such as the Help is In Your Hands.</p> <p>Based on the stakeholders' input, additional review and training is needed for teachers on strategies to enhance their skills and understanding on age-anchor skills in the three outcome measures. This training and technical support for the teachers in aligning the skills for each outcome measures in the child's present level of performance and is reflected in the IEP development and implementation for the child's IEP goals. Further practice sessions with teachers will result in identifying the skills and practices to closely monitor the child's progress throughout the year.</p> <p>The ECSE Program will be aligning the curriculum with the Head Start program. This will include collaborative training activities with ECES and Head Start Teachers.</p>
A2	<p>Guam's performance for this year was at 15.52% (9/58) for 7A2. Of the 58 preschoolers with IEPs that participated in this measurement, there were 9 preschoolers in category “d” and no preschoolers in category “e” with a total of 9 preschoolers that demonstrated functioning within age expectation in positive social emotional skills with Guam's performance at 15.52%. This is a slippage of 8.01% comparison to FFY 2018 performance of 23.53% (16/68). Guam did not meet the target of 57.51% for this reporting period.</p> <p>The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the 37 or 63.79% of the preschoolers that were in category “c” that were children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach in the area of positive social emotional skills. The following data points were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Age at Entry</li> <li>-Length of service</li> <li>-Disability</li> <li>-Setting Data</li> </ul> <p>Based on the data drill down, 18 out of the 37 preschoolers were three years of age, 14 preschoolers were four years of age and five preschoolers were five years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education (ECSE) services.</p> <p>The following data points were analyzed:</p> <p>Length of services. Ten (10) out of the 37 preschoolers received early childhood special education services for less than 11 months of services; 8 preschoolers received less than 23 months of services, and 19 preschoolers received more than 24 months of services.</p> <p>Disability. Eighteen (18) of the 37 were identified as developmental delay; 2 were eligible as Speech and Language delayed; 14 preschoolers were identified as having autism; 1 was eligible as multiple disabilities, and 2 preschoolers were eligible as other health impairment.</p> <p>Settings/ Placement. Nineteen (19) of the preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; 10 preschoolers were in the ECSE classroom; 4 in a typical preschool setting; and 4 received services in the home.</p> <p>Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:</p> <p>There are children with specific conditions such as autism, that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports. The Program discussed the importance of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) strategy that are used for preschoolers with disabilities and not just for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Furthermore, the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM), is an evidence-based intervention that is being implemented for children accessing early childhood special education services.</p> <p>Stakeholders indicated the social aspect, especially for children with ASD, is important to start early in accessing ECSE services to build social-emotional skills. Stakeholders also discussed in great detail the need to work with families to recognize the need of their child early on and not “wait” for their child to catch up developmentally. The Program will begin to address strategies to support families by using the early childhood coaching model as a strategy to support parents and to provide specific parental training using the ESDM Parent coaching modules such as the Help is In Your Hands.</p> <p>Based on the stakeholders' input, additional review and training is needed for teachers on strategies to enhance their skills and understanding on age-anchor skills in the three outcome measures. This training and technical support for the teachers in aligning the skills for each outcome measures in the child's present level of performance and is reflected in the IEP development and implementation for the child's IEP goals. Further practice sessions with teachers will result in identifying the skills and practices to closely monitor the child's progress throughout the year.</p> <p>The ECSE Program will be aligning the curriculum with the Head Start program. This will include collaborative training activities with ECES and Head Start Teachers.</p>
B1	<p>Guam's performance for this year was at 75.86% (44/58) for 7B1. Of the 58, there were 36 preschoolers in category “c” and 8 preschoolers was in category “d” with a total of 44 preschoolers that demonstrated substantially increased in their rate of growth in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. This is a slippage of 12.38% comparison to FFY 2018 performance of 88.24% (60/68). Guam did not meet the target of 86% for this reporting period.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the 13 or 22.41% of the preschoolers in category “b” who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. The following data points were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Age at Entry</li> <li>-Length of service</li> <li>-Disability</li> <li>-Setting Data</li> </ul> <p>Based on the data drill down, six out of the 13 preschoolers were three years of age, six preschoolers were four years of age, and one preschooler was five years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education (ECSE) services.</p> <p>The following data points were analyzed:</p> <p>Length of services. Four (4) of the 13 preschoolers received less 11 months of service, 5 preschoolers had 23 months of services, and 4 preschoolers received more than 24 months of services.</p> <p>Disability. Seven (7) of the 13 were identified as developmental delay; 3 preschoolers were identified as having autism; 2 preschoolers with other health impairments, and one preschooler was eligible as multiple disabilities.</p> <p>Settings/ Placement. Five (5) of the 13 preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; 4 preschoolers were in the ECSE classroom; 2 preschoolers were in a typical preschool setting; and 2 received services in the home.</p> <p>Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:</p> <p>There are children with specific conditions such as autism, that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports. The Program discussed the importance of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) strategy that are used for preschoolers with disabilities and not just for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Furthermore, the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM), is an evidence-based intervention that is being implemented for children accessing early childhood special education services.</p> <p>Stakeholders indicated the social aspect, especially for children with ASD, is important to start early in accessing ECSE services to build social-emotional skills. Stakeholders also discussed in great detail the need to work with families to recognize the need of their child early on and not “wait” for their child to catch up developmentally. The Program will begin to address strategies to support families by using the early childhood coaching model as a strategy to support parents and to provide specific parental training using the ESDM Parent coaching modules such as the Help is In Your Hands.</p> <p>Based on the stakeholders’ input, additional review and training is needed for teachers on strategies to enhance their skills and understanding on age-anchor skills in the three outcome measures. This training and technical support for the teachers in aligning the skills for each outcome measures in the child’s present level of performance and is reflected in the IEP development and implementation for the child’s IEP goals. Further practice sessions with teachers will result in identifying the skills and practices to closely monitor the child’s progress throughout the year.</p> <p>The ECSE Program will be aligning the curriculum with the Head Start program. This will include collaborative training activities with ECES and Head Start Teachers.</p>
<b>B2</b>	<p>Guam’s performance for this year was at 13.79% (8/58) for 7B2. Of the 58, there were 8 preschoolers in category “d” preschoolers and there was no preschooler was in category “e” with a total of 8 preschoolers that demonstrated functioning within age expectation in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills with Guam’s performance at 13.79%. This is a slippage of 6.80% in comparison to FFY 2018 performance of 20.59% (14/68). Guam did not meet the target of 47.51% for this reporting period.</p> <p>The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the 36 or 62.07% of the preschoolers that were in category “c” that are children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach in the area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. The following data points were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Age at Entry</li> <li>-Length of service</li> <li>-Disability</li> <li>-Setting Data</li> </ul> <p>Based on the data drill down, 22 out of the 36 preschoolers were three years of age, 12 preschoolers were four years of age and two preschoolers were five years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education (ECSE) services.</p> <p>The following data points were analyzed:</p> <p>Length of services. Five (5) out of the 36 preschoolers received early childhood special education services for less than 11 months of services; 9 preschoolers received less than 23 months of services, and 22 preschoolers received more than 24 months of services.</p> <p>Disability. Sixteen (16) of the 36 were identified as developmental delay; 3 were eligible as Speech and Language delayed; 15 preschoolers were identified as having autism; 1 was eligible as multiple disabilities, and 1 preschooler was eligible as other health impairment.</p> <p>Settings/ Placement. Twenty-one (21) of the preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; 7 preschoolers were in the ECSE classroom; 4 in a typical preschool setting; and 4 received services in the home.</p> <p>Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:</p> <p>There are children with specific conditions such as autism, that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports. The Program</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>discussed the importance of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) strategy that are used for preschoolers with disabilities and not just for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Furthermore, the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM), is an evidence-based intervention that is being implemented for children accessing early childhood special education services.</p> <p>Stakeholders indicated the social aspect, especially for children with ASD, is important to start early in accessing ECSE services to build social-emotional skills. Stakeholders also discussed in great detail the need to work with families to recognize the need of their child early on and not “wait” for their child to catch up developmentally. The Program will begin to address strategies to support families by using the early childhood coaching model as a strategy to support parents and to provide specific parental training using the ESDM Parent coaching modules such as the Help is In Your Hands.</p> <p>Based on the stakeholders’ input, additional review and training is needed for teachers on strategies to enhance their skills and understanding on age-anchor skills in the three outcome measures. This training and technical support for the teachers in aligning the skills for each outcome measures in the child’s present level of performance and is reflected in the IEP development and implementation for the child’s IEP goals. Further practice sessions with teachers will result in identifying the skills and practices to closely monitor the child’s progress throughout the year.</p> <p>The ECSE Program will be aligning the curriculum with the Head Start program. This will include collaborative training activities with ECES and Head Start Teachers.</p>
C1	<p>Guam’s performance for this year was at 78.95% (45/57) for 7C1. Of the 57 preschoolers that participated in the outcome measure for this reporting period, there were 34 preschoolers in category “c” and 11 preschoolers in category “d” with a total of 45 preschoolers that demonstrated substantially increased rate of growth in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. This is a slippage of 1.65% comparison to FFY 2018 performance of 80.60% (54/67). Guam did not meet the target of 89.32% for this reporting period.</p> <p>The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the 11 or 18.97% preschoolers in category “b” who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. The following data points were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Age at Entry</li> <li>-Length of service</li> <li>-Disability</li> <li>-Setting Data</li> </ul> <p>Based on the data drill down, seven out of the 11 preschoolers were three years of age and four preschoolers were four years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education (ECSE) services.</p> <p>The following data points were analyzed:</p> <p>Length of services. One (1) of the 11 preschoolers received less 11 months of service, 5 preschoolers had 23 months of services, and 5 preschoolers received more than 24 months of services.</p> <p>Disability. Six (6) of the 11 were identified as developmental delay; 3 preschoolers were identified as having autism; 1 preschooler with other health impairments, and 1 preschooler was eligible as multiple disabilities.</p> <p>Settings/ Placement. Four (4) of the preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; 4 preschoolers were in the ECSE classroom; and 3 received services in the home.</p> <p>Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:</p> <p>There are children with specific conditions such as autism, that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports. The Program discussed the importance of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) strategy that are used for preschoolers with disabilities and not just for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Furthermore, the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM), is an evidence-based intervention that is being implemented for children accessing early childhood special education services.</p> <p>Stakeholders indicated the social aspect, especially for children with ASD, is important to start early in accessing ECSE services to build social-emotional skills. Stakeholders also discussed in great detail the need to work with families to recognize the need of their child early on and not “wait” for their child to catch up developmentally. The Program will begin to address strategies to support families by using the early childhood coaching model as a strategy to support parents and to provide specific parental training using the ESDM Parent coaching modules such as the Help is In Your Hands.</p> <p>Based on the stakeholders’ input, additional review and training is needed for teachers on strategies to enhance their skills and understanding on age-anchor skills in the three outcome measures. This training and technical support for the teachers in aligning the skills for each outcome measures in the child’s present level of performance and is reflected in the IEP development and implementation for the child’s IEP goals. Further practice sessions with teachers will result in identifying the skills and practices to closely monitor the child’s progress throughout the year.</p> <p>The ECSE Program will be aligning the curriculum with the Head Start program. This will include collaborative training activities with ECES and Head Start Teachers.</p>
C2	<p>Guam’s performance for this year was at 20.69% (12/58) for 7C2. Of the 58, there were 11 preschoolers in category “d” and one preschooler in category “e” with a total of 12 preschoolers that demonstrated functioning within age expectation in behaviors to meet your needs. This is a slippage of 4.31% in comparison to FFY 2018 performance of 25% (17/68). Guam did not meet the target of 70.01% for this indicator for this reporting period.</p> <p>The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the 34 or 58.62% of the preschoolers that were in category “c” who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach in the area of behaviors to meet your needs. The following data points were reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Age at Entry</li> </ul>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>-Length of service -Disability -Setting Data</p> <p>Based on the data drill down, 20 out of the 34 preschoolers were three years of age, 12 preschoolers were four years of age and two preschoolers were five years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education (ECSE) services.</p> <p>The following data points were analyzed:</p> <p>Length of services. Five (5) out of the 34 preschoolers received early childhood special education services for less than 11 months of services; 7 preschoolers received less than 23 months of services, and 22 preschoolers received more than 24 months of services.</p> <p>Disability. Fifteen (15) of the 34 were identified as developmental delay; 3 were eligible as Speech and Language delayed; 15 preschoolers were identified as having autism; and 1 preschooler was eligible as multiple disabilities.</p> <p>Settings/ Placement. Twenty (20) of the 34 preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; 6 preschoolers were in the ECSE classroom; 5 in a typical preschool setting; and 3 received services in the home.</p> <p>Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:</p> <p>There are children with specific conditions such as autism, that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports. The Program discussed the importance of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) strategy that are used for preschoolers with disabilities and not just for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Furthermore, the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM), is an evidence-based intervention that is being implemented for children accessing early childhood special education services.</p> <p>Stakeholders indicated the social aspect, especially for children with ASD, is important to start early in accessing ECSE services to build social-emotional skills. Stakeholders also discussed in great detail the need to work with families to recognize the need of their child early on and not "wait" for their child to catch up developmentally. The Program will begin to address strategies to support families by using the early childhood coaching model as a strategy to support parents and to provide specific parental training using the ESDM Parent coaching modules such as the Help is In Your Hands.</p> <p>Based on the stakeholders' input, additional review and training is needed for teachers on strategies to enhance their skills and understanding on age-anchor skills in the three outcome measures. This training and technical support for the teachers in aligning the skills for each outcome measures in the child's present level of performance and is reflected in the IEP development and implementation for the child's IEP goals. Further practice sessions with teachers will result in identifying the skills and practices to closely monitor the child's progress throughout the year.</p> <p>The ECSE Program will be aligning the curriculum with the Head Start program. This will include collaborative training activities with ECES and Head Start Teachers.</p>

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COVID-19 Impact: School closure, social distancing, and wearing face masks required special education services to be adjusted from face-to-face to distance learning. This limited the intensity and frequency of interactions with preschoolers with an IEP from March 2020 when schools closed through June 2020 of the reporting period.

**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

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Guam was not able to collect FFY 2019 Indicator 8 performance data to determine if Guam met its FFY 2019 Indicator 8 target. An explanation of parent involvement activities and alternative data collected for FFY 2019 Indicator 8 are described under the "demographics" and "additional information" sections of this Indicator Data page.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	62.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	76.00%	80.00%	80.00%	84.00%	86.00%
Data	82.02%	86.17%	92.74%	71.37%	72.88%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	86.50%

#### 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
		72.88%	86.50%		N/A	N/A

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

#### Percentage of respondent parents

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.

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?	
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.**

Prior to the COVID-19 school closures, there were several parent involvement activities that occurred during FFY 2019. These activities were in response to the FFY2018 indicator results. Listed is a description of the parent involvement activities that occurred before the March 16, 2020 school closure:

The Special Education Process: On September 14, 2019, a parent training on the special education process was held. Parents learned about the special education process from identification to the development and implementation of the IEP. Forty participants attended the session.

National Center on Improving Literacy (NCIL) Family Modules: On October 19, 2019, a parent and teacher session introducing participants to the (NCIL) family modules and family toolkits was conducted. The session was facilitated by Sarah Sayko, NCIL Deputy Director as part of the Pacific State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) convening hosted by Guam Department of Education (GDOE) with all six Pacific entities and supported by OSEP and OSEP-funded National Centers and regional technical assistance providers. Resources for families from NCIL included videos, reading apps, and training modules. Sixty regional participants, including school administrators, teachers, and parents from GDOE, attended the session. Follow-up school-level sessions on how to use the resources on the NCIL website took place at three of the SSIP schools.

School-Level Parent Engagement Activities: Each school committed to continuing the implementation of parent engagement activities for parents and families that included on-going communication with parents and incorporating the parents into their child's learning process. School level activities are

categorized into three areas: School Events: Literacy Night and Community Connections, which included dissemination of the NCIL resources; Family and Community Engagement: Back to School Night, Parent Teacher Conference Fairs, and Super Reader Program; and Communication: Bi-weekly newsletters, Homework Communication Logs, Academic Progress Logs.

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

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the collection of FFY 2019 Indicator 8 performance data were impacted. On March 16, 2020, the Governor of Guam announced the closure of schools and government agencies in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools remained closed until August 2020 with only two models of instruction being offered to families: online and hard-copy learning packets. The abrupt closure of schools did not allow for parent surveys to be distributed to the schools for dissemination to parents. As a consequence, alternative data was gathered to respond to Indicator 8. However, the alternative data is not the same as that provided in previous year's performance for Indicator 8 and therefore cannot be used to make a comparison in performance.

In response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent suspension of survey distribution to parents, other strategies were implemented to collect alternative data. The alternative data was primarily qualitative and was gathered through two different platforms. The two platforms used to collect alternative data included a virtual parent forum and virtual parent input and informational sessions. It should be noted that the alternative data collected was outside the reporting period for FFY2019. This was primarily due to the district's need to evaluate the options available for the safe collection of data amid a pandemic. Listed is a description of the alternative data that was collected: (1) Parent Forum and (2) Pandemic-Related Parent Sessions.

#### **(1) Parent Forum:**

Prior to conducting the parent forum, the methodology for collecting alternative data for this APR was presented to members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members were provided the opportunity to provide input. The GAPSD requested that additional input be obtained related to related services in the IEP and the provision of a one to one aide in the IEP.

#### **Methodology: Data Collection:**

In collaboration and in consultation with the Division of Special Education, GAPSD, and the University of Guam CEDDERS, it was agreed that data for this indicator will differ from previous fiscal years due to COVID-19. It was agreed that data related to parent involvement would be collected through virtual focus group sessions through the Zoom platform and the input reported qualitatively. The planning group agreed that this was the safest method for collecting parent involvement data under COVID-19. In addition, parents were also invited to submit their input through a Qualtrics qualitative survey if they did not participate in the virtual session.

#### **Selection of Participants:**

Three-hundred twelve (312) parents who have a child receiving special education were randomly selected to participate in the forum. Of the 312 parents selected, schools provided email addresses for 121 of the parents. All 121 parents were sent email invitations to attend the parent forum. Seven emails were returned as being undeliverable. Seven parents attended the virtual parent forum on November 25. As a follow-up, the forum questions were emailed to 99 parents who did not attend the forum. Two emails were returned as being undeliverable. Seven parents responded to the online survey. A total of 14 parents, via the virtual session and the online survey, provided input on the following questions:

1.1 How has your child's school helped you to prepare for and participate in your child's IEP meeting? What is your experience with the provision of related services as a component of the IEP? What is your experience of the provision of one-to-one aide as a component of the IEP?

1.2 How has your child's school helped you to understand your child's IEP?

1.3 How has your child's school helped you to help your child by providing training and information?

1.4 How has your child's school communicated with you in order for you to help your child improve in school?

1.5 How has your child's school helped you understand your parent rights?

1.6 What is your experience when your child was initially evaluated or reevaluated to determine the initial or continued need for special education and related services?

1.7 What has been your experience with your child's education since the closing of schools in March or SY2019-2020?

#### **Summary of the Results:**

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a low participation rate in both the virtual parent involvement forum as well as the on-line qualitative survey. The limited communication options with parents informing them about the forum and the online survey may have resulted in the low participation.

The responses to Question #4 clearly indicated that the schools were communicating with the parents through more than one format. For Question #5, the majority of parents indicated they were very stressful about remote learning. Though parents responded to all the questions, some of the responses did not align with the question directly despite the provision and repetition of follow-up prompts.

#### **(2) Pandemic-Related Parent Sessions:**

GDOE Parent Sessions on the Models of Instruction and Supports: Virtual parent input sessions were held on 7/24/20, 11/25/20 and 1/15/21 to collect feedback from parents on the proposed models of instruction and supports that were going to be implemented in response to school closures as result of the COVID-19 pandemic. 20 - 150 parents attended the sessions. During the sessions, parents were given the opportunity to provide input and to discuss any concerns they had in regard to the district's proposed models of instruction.

Written Guidelines and Resources Regarding COVID-19 and IDEA: The Hita Para Mo'na guidelines were completed and shared with families on 7/24/20 during a virtual informational session. 150 parents attended the informational session. The guidelines provided parents with resources and information regarding topics related to remote learning. Topics included: teacher preparation, interim IEPs, transition services, related services, evaluations, online learning, and personal protective equipment (PPE). In addition, the Hita Para Mo'na guidelines were uploaded to the GDOE website for parents to access along with other COVID-19 and IDEA resources. See link:

<https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/Special%20Education%20Update%20September%2010%2C%202020.pdf>

Parent Topical Training Sessions: Beginning September 2020, bi-monthly parent topical training sessions were conducted by GDOE. The purpose of the parent topical training sessions was to respond to the emergent needs of families as a result of COVID-19. This involved supporting parents in building their knowledge and skills in specific areas. Topics covered in these sessions included: Teletherapy, Using BookShare; Distance Learning, Social Emotional Development, and Supporting Literacy Development at Home. The training sessions provided resources and tips to support families in improving the outcomes of their child during the pandemic. An average of about 40 parents attended the various sessions.



### **8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **8 - OSEP Response**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Guam did not provide data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether Guam met its target.

### **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.**

As per OSEP's instructions, this Indicator is not applicable to Guam.

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to Guam.

### 9 - Required Actions

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for 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

As per OSEP's instructions, this Indicator is not applicable to Guam.

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 10 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to Guam.

### 10 - Required Actions

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # 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	44.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.94%	97.68%	93.49%	93.42%	96.58%

### 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
333	283	96.58%	100%	84.98%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage**

In FFY 2019, Guam did not meet its Indicator 11 compliance target of 100% with a performance of 84.98% (283/333). Guam's FFY 2019 performance was not an improvement from last year's FFY 2018 substantial compliance of 96.58% (311/322), which represents slippage. A major reason for the slippage was due to the public health restrictions placed on the education department in response to the global health crisis.

Of the 50 initial evaluations not completed within 60 days of receiving parental consent, 25 or 50% were pending at the end of the reporting year due to the school closure and public health requirements for social distancing and wearing of face masks.

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a public health emergency declared for Guam in March 2020. Schools were closed and social distancing and wearing of face masks were required. These public health emergency directives impacted the evaluators' ability to administer appropriate tests for initial evaluations. Beginning May 2020, the Division facilitated technical assistance and training activities for evaluators on administering virtual assessments – telehealth assessments. This training effort continues in school year 2020-2021.

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

50

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

By range of days beyond the 60-day timeline, the following accounts for the children included in (a) but not included in (b):

# Students = 12

# Days after 60-Day Timeline = 1-30 days

Reasons for Delay = Program Delay

# Students = 6

# Days after 60-Day Timeline = 31-60 days

Reasons for Delay = Program Delay

# Students = 7

# Days after 60-Day Timeline = 61+ days

Reasons for Delay = Program Delay

# Students = 25 = Pending initial evaluations at the end of the reporting period due to COVID-19

TOTAL NUMBER STUDENTS = 50

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

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

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****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
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
FFY 2013	3	0	3

**FFY 2013****Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected****Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018:

In FFY 2018, Indicator 11 performance was 96.58% (311/322) substantial compliance with the 60-day initial evaluation timeline. As described in the FFY 2018 APR, there were 11 initial evaluations that were completed over the 60-day timeline. These individual noncompliance were part of the subsequent data for the findings of noncompliance issued to the Division of Special Education in FFY 2013. Therefore, a written notice of noncompliance findings was not issued for the FFY 2018 Indicator 11 noncompliance data.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected:

The three FFY 2013 findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained in FFY 2019 for not being able to demonstrate correct implementation of the 60-day timeline requirement for subsequent data.

On January 22, 2020, GDOE's Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) reported that the three findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained "not yet verified as corrected" because the Division was unable to demonstrate correct implementation of the Child Find compliance requirements for initial evaluations.

Although the individual instances of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2018 Indicator 11 performance data were completed over the 60-day timeline, the subsequent data or initial evaluations required at the beginning of school year 2019-2020 were not completed timely, as indicated in the January 22, 2020 CMO memo.

On August 18, 2020, CMO reported that the Division has not corrected beyond the one-year timeline for the 60-day initial evaluation timeline requirement. CMO's report however verified that the pending initial evaluations indicated in the January 22, 2020 memo were completed over the 60-day timeline.

The CMO August 18, 2020 report also included pending initial evaluations with parent consents to evaluate that were received just before and during the school closure due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which included the 25 initial evaluations pending at the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period indicated in the FFY 2019 Indicator 11 performance data.

**Actions Taken to Address Noncompliance****COVID-19 Impact:**

As described in the FFY 2019 Indicator 11 narrative, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the ability for GDOE to administer appropriate tests for initial evaluations. The Governor of Guam declared a public health emergency in mid-March 2020 closing all schools. The GDOE started to offer distance learning opportunities to students through online or a hard copy packet curriculum. Distance learning continued at the beginning of school year 2020-2021 with limited face-to-face instruction starting on January 19, 2021.

To address the impact of the public health emergency of requiring social distancing and wearing of face masks, the Division of Special Education facilitated virtual training sessions with the Division evaluators on how to administer appropriate assessments virtually. An example of this shift from conducting face-to-face individual assessments to virtual assessments is with personnel certified to administer the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule, 2nd Edition (ADOS-2). The ADOS-2 is an appropriate assessment for identifying children with autism spectrum disorders (ASD); however, this assessment cannot be administered virtually. The certified ADOS-2 personnel therefore had to receive training on administering the Brief Observation of Symptoms of Autism (BOSA), which is a tele-health assessment designed to identify children with ASD. Training on tele-health assessments ensures that assessments conducted virtually are valid and reliable, which is expected to continue through school year 2020-2021.

**Non-Adherence to Procedures:**

The review of untimely initial evaluations for the psycho-educational, hearing, and speech-language evaluations was conducted to address the non-adherence to procedures. The Division reviewed its standard operating procedures and tracking mechanisms with its personnel who submit referral documents and conduct evaluations. Weekly reports were generated by the Data Office and sent to Program Leads to track the status of the completion of all evaluations. This practice has reduced the number of delays. However, with the continued issues related to non-adherence to procedures, the Division created a work group comprised of representatives from each Division Unit to revise its Standards of Practice or guidelines for implementing the special education procedures, including the use of the special education forms.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, in February 2020, the Division held a session with all Division personnel to review and provide final input to the Standards of Practice or guidelines for immediate implementation. However, with the COVID-19 pandemic impacting school operations and how assessments are conducted, the guidance had to shift to providing technical support to the evaluators on conducting tele-health assessments.

**Lack of Personnel:**

Lack of personnel related to OT evaluations, as reported in previous APRs, has been addressed through a small purchase for on-island OT services, which include OT evaluations. In addition, in November 2019, the Division hired a part-time OT which has assisted with the completion of pending OT

evaluations and the delivery of required OT services.

## **11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **11 - OSEP Response**

Guam did not demonstrate that it corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Guam did not report that it verified that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

## **11 - Required Actions**

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, and remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013, Guam: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within Guam's jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** 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.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	90.00%

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 who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	67
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	31



c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	34
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	2
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	34	34	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**  
0

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

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Progress and maintenance of the 100% compliance may be attributed to the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) developed for this Indicator. In keeping with this SOP, the Part B Preschool IEP Coordinators (IEPCs) continue to document efforts in communicating with families during the transition period to address any issues that may affect timely transitions. A Parent Contact Log is used to document any occurrences and is submitted with accompanying documents that initiate a referral from Part C to Part B. The IEPCs submit a Part B Tracking Form - Transition from C to B, along with a Data Entry Form, that documents any reasons for delay, should there be a delay.

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

Guam Part C provides a monthly report on all LEA notifications sent to Part B. The Part B data system keeps track of all LEA notifications submitted and provides the SPC for the Birth Through Five Program a monthly report that includes a calculated percentage using OSEP's measurement for Indicator 12, of those children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday.

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

COVID-19 Impact: There were two children whose parents refused consent to evaluate accounting for exceptional circumstances; of which, one was related to the school closure due to COVID-19. These two children eventually had their initial IEPs developed: One in September 2019 prior to the COVID-19 pandemic and the other in August 2020 during the continued COVID-19 public health emergency.

**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

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

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** 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 =  $\left[ \left( \frac{\text{\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority}}{\text{\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above}} \right) \times 100 \right]$

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	99.84%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.06%	91.32%	90.77%	85.21%	97.32%

### 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
397	476	97.32%	100%	83.40%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

For reporting period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020, there were a total of 476 youth aged 16 and above with an IEP. Of the 476 youth, 83.40% (397/476) had an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable them to meet their post-secondary goals. Based on this reported data, Guam Part B did not meet the 100% compliance for Indicator 13 during this reporting period, with its performance representing slippage from last reporting year's FFY 2018 performance of 97.32% (545/560). The reasons for this slippage can be attributed to the following:

- 57 IEPs were not current, but the transition plans met IND 13 requirements.
- 11 IEPs were current, but the transition plans did not meet IND 13 requirements.
- 11 IEPs were not current with transition plans that did not meet IND 13 requirements.

The March 2020 school closures impacted the facilitation of annual IEP reviews from face-to-face to videoconferencing or phone communication. The public health crisis required social distancing and wearing of face masks. Schools transitioned to distance learning. The COVID-19 pandemic impacted the IEP team reviews which contributed to the Indicator 13 slippage.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

To calculate Indicator 13 performance, Guam Part B uses data from the special education data system for the entire reporting period. The Division of Special Education Data Office inputs the student IEP data into the special education data system based on the submitted data sheets and IEP documents from the schools. The data sheet includes verification that the IEP meets the secondary transition requirements for youth with disabilities aged 16 and older. As IEP meetings are held during the school year, the data sheets and IEPs are submitted to the Division Data Office for input into the special education data system. The special education data system is updated with each students' current information and status. At the end of the reporting period, Guam Part B verifies current Indicator 13 data for those youth with IEPs for the entire reporting period.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

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

**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
27	0	0	27

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected:

In FFY 2018, the GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) issued a written notification of noncompliance findings to one high school for not meeting the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. A total of 27 individual instances of noncompliance was identified in the written notification of noncompliance issued to the one high school.

The FFY 2018 APR Indicator 13 performance data of 97.32% (545/560) was part of the individual instances of noncompliance identified for the one high school, as well as subsequent data for verified correction of noncompliance from findings identified in FFY 2017.

In June 2020, the CMO verified correction of noncompliance through a review of the school data report. The June 2020 verification memorandum indicated that the high school did not meet the verified correction of noncompliance requirement based on the subsequent data reviewed not meeting 100% compliance. The June 2020 memorandum did acknowledge the correction of the 27 individual instances of noncompliance, which were the findings of noncompliance issued to the high school in FFY 2018.

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected:

In the June 2020 "failure to correct" memorandum, the CMO required the high school to specifically correct the subsequent data or pending IEPs listed in the report. In addition, the CMO indicated that a follow-up verification of subsequent correction would be scheduled in school year 2020-2021.

As discussed in Indicator 13, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted school operations and service delivery for all students. The GDOE schools closed mid-March 2020 and provided options for students to continue learning through an online platform or a hard copy packet curriculum. Due to the public health emergency requirements of social distancing and wearing of a face mask, many IEPs that include the secondary transition requirements were not completed before the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period, as reflected in the FFY 2019 Indicator 13 performance data.

It should be noted that Guam's public health emergency continued in school year 2020-2021 with limited face-to-face instruction made available to students effective January 19, 2021. Online learning and hard copy packet curriculum continue to be options for students. Because of the social distancing requirements and the closure of schools beginning mid-March 2020, schools have had to resort to alternatives, such as videoconferencing or phone calls, for scheduling and holding IEP meetings. With limited face-to-face instruction available effective January 19, 2021, scheduling face-to-face IEP meetings will need to be carefully planned to ensure safety protocols are adhered to during Guam's continued public health emergency declaration.

**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

Guam did not demonstrate that it corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 a because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, Guam did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

### 13 - Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining 27 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that for findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019, and remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018, Guam: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within Guam's jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## 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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .

#### 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 >=	17.00%	18.00%	19.00%	20.00%	21.00%
A	11.00%	Data	15.25%	16.30%	4.60%	23.19%	16.67%
B	2009	Target >=	60.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%
B	51.00%	Data	59.32%	61.96%	49.43%	66.67%	62.75%
C	2009	Target >=	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
C	60.00%	Data	71.19%	69.57%	55.17%	68.12%	72.55%

### FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	21.00%
Target B >=	64.00%
Target C >=	71.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are

members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### 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	88
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	13
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	44
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	1
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0

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)	13	88	16.67%	21.00%	14.77%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	57	88	62.75%	64.00%	64.77%	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)	58	88	72.55%	71.00%	65.91%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
<b>A</b>	<p>Guam did not meet its targets for Indicator 14A and 14C, demonstrating slippage for both measures. This slippage could be attributed to the lower response rate from previous year. In FFY 2018, the response rate was 67.55% (102/151), and in FFY 2019, the response rate was 55.35% (88/159); a decrease of 14 leavers surveyed in FFY 2019 compared to FFY 2018. The lower response rate could be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions that limited teachers from meeting with the leavers. The teachers were not able to go into the community to locate the leavers.</p> <p>In addition, some of the feedback from leavers who completed the post-school outcomes survey and were listed under the category of "not engaged" indicated that they were taking care of children, tried to look for a job, or applied for a job but was not hired. It should be noted that looking for a job during the public health emergency would have been even more difficult.</p>
<b>C</b>	<p>Guam did not meet its targets for Indicator 14A and 14C, demonstrating slippage for both measures. This slippage could be attributed to the lower response rate from previous year. In FFY 2018, the response rate was 67.55% (102/151), and in FFY 2019, the response rate was 55.35% (88/159); a decrease of 14 leavers surveyed in FFY 2019 compared to FFY 2018. The lower response rate could be attributed</p>



Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>to the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions that limited teachers from meeting with the leavers. The teachers were not able to go into the community to locate the leavers.</p> <p>In addition, some of the feedback from leavers who completed the post-school outcomes survey and were listed under the category of “not engaged” indicated that they were taking care of children, tried to look for a job, or applied for a job but was not hired. It should be noted that looking for a job during the public health emergency would have been even more difficult.</p>

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

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

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?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	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.**

Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of: (a) disability type, (b) ethnicity, (c) gender, and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to, or different from, the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2018-2019. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of  $\pm 3\%$  are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a  $\pm 3\%$  interval.

For FFY 2019, Guam reported that the data collected from its respondents was not representative of the 2018-2019 leaver population. This was based on the data reported in the NTACT Response Calculator for FFY 2019; specifically, respondents were underrepresented in the minority category and overrepresented in all other disabilities and the minority leavers for this reporting year.

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?	NO

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

Strategies and Improvement Activities to Address Representativeness:

Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 14 for FFY 2019 was 55.35%. This means that of the 159 students who left school last year, post-school outcome information was not available for 44.65% (n = 71) of the Leavers who exited the Guam Department of Education. This FFY 2019 response rate is a decrease from last year's response rate of 67.55 % (102/151) rate for Indicator 14.

Initially, surveys were sent out through the mail using the home addresses on file. Personnel from the Division of Special Education Transition Office found it quite challenging as many of the surveys mailed out came back with a “Return to Sender” message. Other attempts to contact the Leavers included contacting them through phone or Facebook. Many of the phone numbers on record were either disconnected or no longer in use; and although contacts were made with some Leavers via the social media, the Leavers did not respond to requests made for them to contact Division personnel.

Guam Part B will continue its efforts to increase the response rate for Indicator 14, with particular attention to the Leavers that fall under the dropout category. Additional steps to increase the response rate will include follow-up activities with the Leavers and/or their families and to ensure that the respondents are representative of Guam's population:

- Before leaving or graduating from school, the demographics are updated.
- Demographics are updated periodically within the year of leaving high school.
- Continue alternative methods, such as Facebook.

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

COVID-19 Impact: The Government shutdown with business closures limited the opportunities for employment for leavers. Follow-up by the teachers with the leavers was also limited because of the social distancing requirements. This impacted not only the ability for the Division of Special Education Transition Office to conduct the post-school outcomes survey with the leavers, but also for leavers to seek employment opportunities.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

Guam responded to the Indicator 14 required actions within the Indicator 14 indicator data section.

## **14 - OSEP Response**

### **14 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions that Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### 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	8
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	7

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School

Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data	100.00%	100.00%	85.71%	100.00%	50.00%

#### 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
7	8	50.00%		87.50%	N/A	N/A

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

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Data Table 7: Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act for reporting year 2019-2020, there were eight (8) requests for due process hearing complaints filed during FFY 2019. Resolution sessions were held for seven (7) as required by procedures with written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings. One is a due process complaint pending with an extended timeline.

Additionally, as per OSEP's instructions, States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than ten (10). Guam Part B, therefore, has not established a baseline or determined targets for Indicator 15.

#### 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 15 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

#### 15 - Required Actions

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii))$  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

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR to OSEP. In addition, although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2019, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the public health requirements for social distancing and gatherings, the development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2019 SPP/APR involved input sessions conducted virtually through Zoom videoconferencing. The sessions were held as follows:

October 20, 2019: Plans for collecting and reporting Indicator 8 alternative data were reviewed with the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), Guam Part B's broad stakeholder group. GAPSD members provided input on the process and data elements to be collected. Refer to Indicator 8 for a description of the process and outcomes.

December 3, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 15, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 4, 5, 11, 15, and 16. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

December 17, 2019: A work session was held with members from GAPSD to review data for Indicators 6, 7, 8, and 12. Progress data were reviewed with members providing input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred.

January 15, 2021: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input on performance, COVID-19 impact, and reasons for slippage. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel/GAPSD or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals, including a representative from the office of the Senator in charge of the legislative education committee. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 15, 2021: An electronic copy of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR executive summary and at-a-glance were provided to all GDOE Leadership and School Administrators to gather input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred and information regarding the COVID-19 impact on data collection and reporting.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data			100.00%	0.00%	

#### 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)

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Table 7: Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act for reporting year 2019-2020, there were no requests for mediation filed during this reporting period.

Additionally, as per OSEP's instructions, States are not required to establish a baseline or determine targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. When the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, States are to establish a baseline, determine targets and develop improvement activities, and to report on them in the corresponding APR.

#### 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 16 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. Guam 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:**

Yolanda S. Gabriel

#### **Title:**

Assistant Superintendent

#### **Email:**

ysgabriel@gdoe.net

#### **Phone:**

6713001322

#### **Submitted on:**

04/27/21 7:30:39 PM