

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

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2022**

**Guam**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2024**

**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 2021 through FFY 2025. A description of Guam's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR, and how Guam will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of Guam's FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

For this FFY 2022 SPP/APR, Guam stakeholders maintained the targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2025. This FFY 2022 APR includes current performance data on 13 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. Performance data for Indicators 3 and 17 are not included as Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math to all students. Participation and proficiency data is unavailable for students with IEPs who participated with and without accommodations in the district-wide assessment for Indicator 3A, 3B and 3D. Performance data for students with IEPs who participated in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards is reported in 3C. Additionally, data for the SiMR is unavailable for Indicator 17. Per OSEP's instructions, Indicators 9 and 10 do not apply to Guam. In addition, Indicator 4B also does not apply to Guam. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, Guam reports FFY 2022 data to determine if Guam met its FFY 2022 target, an explanation of slippage if Guam did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from FFY 2021, and a response to any issues identified for the Indicator in the 2023 OSEP SPP/APR Determination Letter for Guam's FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Furthermore, as required for Indicator 17, Guam's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), is included in this submission for FFY 2022.

### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

For relevant FFY 2022 APR Indicators, information is provided on the data collection and reporting that were impacted by Super Typhoon Mawar which devastated the island in May 2023. For any Indicator that was impacted, Guam Part B reported on the impact of performance, data completeness and the validity and reliability of the data. If there was an impact, an explanation of how this natural disaster specifically affected Guam's ability to collect the data for each impacted Indicator; and the steps Guam took to mitigate the impact of Super Typhoon Mawar on the data collection.

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

1

### General Supervision System:

**The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).**

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.

For this reporting period, 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. For the next APR reporting period, Guam will report the CMO falling directly under the Superintendent of Education. Comprehensive Monitoring is a process that identifies and corrects procedural noncompliance with Part B IDEA requirements. It is an essential component of the Integrated Monitoring System and assists the CMO in determining a school's strengths and weaknesses with the implementation of the IDEA and related policies and procedures. Monitoring activities include file record reviews and interviews with program personnel and parents.

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

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

### Technical Assistance System:

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

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

The goals of the strategic plan are to promote the professional learning of teachers, administrators and instructional staff to improve the quality of instruction in all classrooms; support the establishment of collaborative structures in schools and school systems to allow for identification, sharing,

development and dissemination of best practices through the district; support the diverse curricular programs and multiple pathways to success such as career academies, career and technical education, academic plans, and job certification programs; support the incorporation of literacy strategies in all content areas; support the multiple data sources to determine and monitor student achievement, along with the training of staff to utilize the data; and support the alignment of district and school policies and practices towards key strategies meant to support student achievement at all levels.

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

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

Furthermore, Guam Part B received technical assistance and support for the development of Guam's FFY 2022 State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report through OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources such as the NCSI, NCII, NCEO, DaSY Center, IDC, ECTAC, CIFR, NTACT, WINTACT, the Progress Center, and the Partner Support Center for the required IDEA 618 data submissions in the EDPass System. Guam Part B also partners with and receives technical assistance and support from the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS).

#### **Professional Development System:**

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

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

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

In addition to these designated professional development days, there are also training days identified to focus on IEP-specific related training and support and program level needs such as Safe Crisis Management, the implementation of discipline procedures for students with disabilities, the IEP Process (initial referrals, reevaluations, eligibility, developing IEPs, transition plans, Common Core State Standards - 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 programmatic needs of each Unit.

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

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

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

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

#### **Stakeholder Engagement:**

**The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.

- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

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

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

42

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

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

For each of the Indicators, historical and current data was presented to show “trends” and “patterns” of performance beginning with FFY 2016 through FFY 2022. By doing this, stakeholders could see the growth or change from year to year with each of the Indicators. This was done so stakeholders could analyze the data in order to view progress or slippage towards meeting the targets.

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

During the discussion surrounding Indicator 13, GAPSD members engaged in a healthy discussion regarding outside agency support for students with disabilities aged 16 and above. The GAPSD representative from this outside agency informed the group the steps the Guam Department of Integrated Services for Individuals with Disabilities (DISID) were taking to become more active in the development of transition plans for students with IEPs aged 16 and above in the GDOE schools.

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

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

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

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

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

Two sessions were held to discuss the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety, inclusive of the SSIP. One session was held virtually, while the other session was held both in-person and available to families via Zoom.

For this FFY2022 reporting period, the Indicators in the SPP/APR was presented through a “story” about how these indicators may influence the life of a child and the family under the Individuals with Disability Education Act (IDEA). This educational timeline story was presented during a session at the SPP/APR summit sponsored by the IDEA Data Center in November 2023. Guam Part B adapted this story and “Guamified” it to make it relevant to its stakeholders.

#### **Soliciting Public Input:**

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

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

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

Stakeholders provided their input, ideas, and recommendations vocally, if they attended sessions in-person or virtually, and through email. The timeline for soliciting stakeholder input was set for Tuesday, January 30, 2024.

#### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation was done through email announcements and through announcements on social media.

The timeline for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies and evaluations were made available to the public by January 30, 2024 via email. Throughout the entire stakeholder process and presentation of the SPP/APR, stakeholders were apprised of the progress in each of the Indicators. By February 1, 2024, the first submission of the FFY 2022 SPP/APR will be provided to GAPSD members, with the understanding that revisions may be made upon OSEP’s review and recommendation for clarification during the week or period of clarification anticipated in April 2024.

#### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.**

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

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

## **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

## **Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Guam's determination for 2023 reported a score of zero ("0") for the "long standing noncompliance" indicator in the 2023 Compliance Matrix for Guam Part B's grant special conditions and uncorrected identified noncompliance. Guam, therefore, provides the following information related to the technical assistance received and actions taken related to Guam's Part B grant special condition:

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

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

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

Furthermore, in October 2020, GDOE was awarded an OSEP State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo'na to support its system's professional development improvements, especially during these uncertain times and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Technical assistance for the implementation of Project Hita Para Mo'na is through the partnership established with one of Guam's local parent organizations, Autism Community Together (ACT); Guam's higher education technical assistance provider and preservice program, University of Guam CEDDERS and School of Education; and the national special education leadership organization, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). Guam Part B completed its third year of implementation of the SPDG in October 2023 and entered its fourth year November 1, 2023.

## **Intro - OSEP Response**

Guam's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed Guam that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance. Guam provided the required information.

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on Guam's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years. Those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the Department's 2024 determination.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In Guam's 2024 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	85.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	85.00%	86.00%
Data	85.42%	85.81%	83.33%	85.00%	96.55%

### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	117
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	19



**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
117	136	96.55%	87.00%	86.03%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

For FFY 2022, Guam did not meet the target for Indicator 1 with its performance of 86.03% (117/136). The reasons for slippage may be attributed to the number of students with IEPs returning to school after COVID-19 who did not have enough credits to graduate, which in turn impacted the number of students with IEPs who exited during the SY2021-2022 with a high school diploma. This reason, along with the number of students who were reported in FS009 as "drop outs" during this reporting period could be the cause for the slippage in meeting the target for FFY 2022.

In SY2021-2022, there was a delay in schools opening for face-to-face instruction due to another surge of COVID-19 cases. This disruption might have caused concerns with parents and students about engaging in virtual learning and returning to school. There continued to be COVID-19 mitigation measures enforced until November 2021 and January 2022 when schools opened for face-to-face learning.

At the time exiting data was collected and reported for FS009, there were 19 students with disabilities in the "Drop Out" category. Case Managers at each of the high schools were challenged with locating these students as they were a "no show" when GDOE opened its doors for in-person learning. Case Managers were following the GDOE Board Policy 411 (BP411) that mandated school attendance. Once a student accumulates three (3) unexcused absences, interventions are initiated beginning with a conference with the student. Subsequent interventions are applied at six (6), nine (9) and twelve (12) unexcused absences. These interventions include mandatory conference with administrator and parent, referral to a School Resource Officer (SRO), and referral to a School Guidance Counselor.

Once a student accrues 12 or more unexcused absences, the student is referred to the Superintendent for further action. School Resource Officers (Attendance Officers) from the Student Support Division are then assigned to assist the schools with locating students who are a "no show" or "hard to find." The results of this assistance yielded a lower number of students with disabilities returning to school to continue their education.

Additionally, extensive drill down activities conducted by the Division transition personnel revealed that six (6) of the 19 students with disabilities who were reported as "drop out" in FS009 either returned back to a GDOE school or a private school to earn the required number of credits to graduate in SY2022-2023.

To further address the slippage, the Division Data Office revised its exiting codes in the SPED Data Dictionary for "Drop Out" and included a description on the use and applicability of this exiting code: "Drop Out" code is used for students with disabilities at 14 years old through age 18 years or older. This is in line with GDOE's BP 330 and 17 Guam Code Annotated (GCA) Chapter 6, Pupils, that notes 18 years as the compulsory age for education.

The Division Data Office will also continue its quality control checks with the GDOE Student Information System, Power School, to cross-reference the students with IEPs in the 12th grade in each of the high schools and the students exiting the system through graduation with a high school diploma or dropping out of school.

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

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

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

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**
**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**
**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED<sup>2</sup>Facts file specification FS009.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	14.17%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.25%	1.19%	1.15%	14.17%	14.00%
Data	3.62%	3.58%	2.50%	14.17%	3.45%

### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.50%	13.00%	12.50%	12.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	117
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	19

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
19	136	3.45%	13.50%	13.97%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

For FFY 2022, Guam did not meet the target for Indicator 2 with its performance of 13.97% (19/136). The reasons for slippage for Indicator 2 are as follows:

In SY2021-2022, there was a delay in schools opening for face-to-face instruction due to another surge of COVID-19 cases. This disruption might have caused concerns with parents and students about engaging in virtual learning and returning to school. There continued to be COVID-19 mitigation measures enforced until November 2021 and January 2022 when schools opened for face-to-face learning.

At the time when FS009 data was collected and reported for SY2021-2022, the six high schools submitted data reflecting 19 students with IEPs who dropped out of school. After extensive drill down activities conducted by Division transition personnel for this FFY2022 reporting period, the actual drop out data should have reflected a lesser number of students with IEPs dropping out of school. It should be noted that the case managers at the high schools had challenges with locating these students, especially after COVID-19. A breakdown of these 19 students are as follows:

- 6 of the 19 students returned to school and graduated in SY2022-2023 by attending either a Guam private school; Asmuyao, which is an independent study school; or the Guam Community College to earn a General Educational Diploma (GED);
- 2 of the 19 students moved off-island and continued their education;
- 11 of the 19 students dropped out, with 2 students who are currently employed, while the remaining 9 students continued to be a "no show" and are considered "voluntarily withdrawn" or dropped out of high school.

To further address the slippage, the Division Data Office revised its exiting codes in the SPED Data Dictionary for "Drop Out" and included a description on the use and applicability of this exiting code: "Drop Out" code is used for students with disabilities 14 years old through age 18 years or older. This is in line with GDOE's BP 330 and 17 Guam Code Annotated (GCA) Chapter 6, Pupils, that notes 18 years as the compulsory age for education.

The Division Data Office will also continue its quality control checks with the GDOE Student Information System, Power School, to cross-reference the students with IEPs in the 12th grade in each of the high schools and the students exiting the system through graduation with a high school diploma or dropping out of school.

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

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

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

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

NO

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

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

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

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

## **Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in

the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

##### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

##### Date:

01/10/2024

#### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	100	137	230
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	12	15	21

##### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

##### Date:

01/10/2024

#### Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	100	137	230
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	12	14	21

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

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

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12	100	87.61%	70.00%	12.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	15	137	81.10%	60.00%	10.95%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	21	230	53.42%	50.00%	9.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

For FFY 2022, Guam did not meet the targets for Indicator 3. The reasons for slippage are attributed to the following:

During SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for all students. Data is not available for students without disabilities who participated in the district-wide assessment. Additionally, there is no data available for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment with or without accommodations.

Guam administered the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. Data for these students with IEPs are reported in the assessment files and is prepopulated in Indicator 3 for this APR reporting period.

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

Please refer to the "Reasons for Slippage" in Group A.

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

Please refer to the "Reasons for Slippage" in Group A.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12	100	85.84%	70.00%	12.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	14	137	81.10%	60.00%	10.22%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	21	230	53.85%	50.00%	9.13%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

For FFY 2022, Guam did not meet the targets for Indicator 3. The reasons for slippage are attributed to the following:

During SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for all students. Data is not available for students without disabilities who participated in the district-wide assessment. Additionally, there is no data available for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment with or without accommodations.

Guam administered the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. Data for these students with IEPs are reported in the assessment files and is prepopulated in Indicator 3 for this APR reporting period.

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

Please refer to the "Reasons for Slippage" in Group A.

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

Please refer to the "Reasons for Slippage" in Group A.

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

The Annual State of Public Education (ASPER) is the public report that contains information on assessment results for all students. The link for the annual reports is as follows:

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

It should be noted, however, that for SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment to all its students. As of this report writing, the SY2022-2023 ASPER has not been posted on the GDOE website.

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

For SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for all students. Data is not available for students without disabilities who participated in the district-wide assessment. Additionally, there is no data available for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment with or without accommodations.

Guam sought guidance from OSEP regarding the submission of assessment files 175, 178, 185 and 188. The instructions OSEP provided include the following:



For the participation data files, ensure all children with disabilities who were enrolled during the testing window are accounted in 185 and 188. Those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should be reported under the permitted value for non-participants (NPART) in the assessment participation data files.

Additionally, for the participation data files, enter -1 for the regular with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGPARTWOACC & REGPARTWACC; for high school: PHSRGASMIWOACC & PHSRGASMIWACC ).

For the performance data files, those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should NOT be reported in files 175 and 178.

Additionally, please report -1 for the Regular assessment with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGASSWOACC & REGASSWACC; for high school: HSREGASMTIWOACC & HSREGASMTIWACC).

Beginning School Year 23-24, the GDOE will administer the following District-wide Assessments: Smarter Balanced Assessments and the Multi-State Alternate Assessment for students in grades 3 through 8 and 11 in Spring of each year. Complete assessment data for IND 3 will be reported in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

### **3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3A - OSEP Response**

Guam did not administer its regular Statewide assessment during the reporting period, to children with or without disabilities, and could not provide complete data as a result. Guam submitted data under this indicator related only to children with IEPs participating in the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards. As a result, OSEP could not determine whether Guam met its targets.

Guam did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results.

### **3A - Required Actions**

Guam did not provide data for FFY 2022. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held

virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.

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

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.

- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

## **FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

### **Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### **Date:**

01/10/2024

### **Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

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

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

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

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			0.00%	5.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			8.40%	5.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			1.68%	5.00%		N/A	N/A

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Gr ou p</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2022 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2022 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4			0.00%	5.00%		N/A	N/A
<b>B</b>	Grade 8			4.20%	5.00%		N/A	N/A
<b>C</b>	Grade HS			0.00%	5.00%		N/A	N/A

## Regulatory Information

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

## Public Reporting Information

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

The Annual State of Public Education (ASPER) is the public report that contains information on assessment results for all students. The link for the annual reports is as follows:

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

It should be noted, however, that for SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment to all its students. As of this report writing, the SY2022-2023 ASPER has not been posted on the GDOE website.

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

For SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for all students. Data is not available for students without disabilities who participated in the district-wide assessment. Additionally, there is no data available for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment with or without accommodations.

Guam sought guidance from OSEP regarding the submission of assessment files 175, 178, 185 and 188. The instructions OSEP provided include the following:

For the participation data files, ensure all children with disabilities who were enrolled during the testing window are accounted in 185 and 188. Those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should be reported under the permitted value for non-participants (NPART) in the assessment participation data files.

Additionally, for the participation data files, enter -1 for the regular with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGPARTWOACC & REGPARTWACC; for high school: PHSRGASMIWOACC & PHSRGASMIWACC ).

For the performance data files, those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should NOT be reported in files 175 and 178.

Additionally, please report -1 for the Regular assessment with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGASSWOACC & REGASSWACC; for high school: HSREGASMTIWOACC & HSREGASMTIWACC).

Beginning School Year 23-24, the GDOE will administer the following District-wide Assessments: Smarter Balanced Assessments and the Multi-State Alternate Assessment for students in grades 3 through 8 and 11 in Spring of each year. Complete assessment data for IND 3 will be reported in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

## **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **3B - OSEP Response**

Guam did not administer its regular Statewide assessment during the reporting period, to children with or without disabilities, and could not provide data under this indicator as a result. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether Guam met its targets.

Guam did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results.

## **3B - Required Actions**

Guam did not provide data for FFY 2022. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	0.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	7.69%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	33.33%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	20.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	38.46%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	33.33%

### Targets

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

## **Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in



the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

##### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

##### Date:

01/10/2024

#### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	12	15	21
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	3	1	7

##### Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

##### Date:

01/10/2024

#### Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	12	14	21
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	4	1	6

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3	12	9.09%	3.00%	25.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1	15	7.14%	8.50%	6.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	7	21	33.33%	34.00%	33.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

For FFY2022, Guam did not meet the target for 3C in Reading for 8th grade students with IEPs who participated in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards with its performance of 6.67% (1/15). The reasons for the slippage may be attributed to the Priority Standards, Skills, and Topics (PSSTs) selected by the GDOE for the entire school year. These PSSTs may not have been aligned to the core content standards that are assessed in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

To address the slippage, Guam will engage the teachers of these students in a discussion about how to increase student performance through the review of the PSSTs and the skills assessed in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards as there appears to be a misalignment between these academic standards. Additionally, a review of the evidence-based practices utilized will be conducted to determine if additional training is needed to support teachers in improving student outcomes.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4	12	28.57%	12.00%	33.33%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1	14	14.29%	12.00%	7.14%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	6	21	33.33%	34.00%	28.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

For FFY2022, Guam did not meet the target for 3C in Math for 8th grade students with IEPs who participated in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards with its performance of 7.14% (1/14). The reasons for the slippage may be attributed to the Priority Standards, Skills, and Topics (PSSTs) selected by the GDOE for the entire school year. These PSSTs may not have been aligned to the core content standards that are assessed in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

To address the slippage, Guam will engage the teachers of these students in a discussion about how to increase student performance through the review of the PSSTs and the skills assessed in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards as there appears to be a misalignment between these academic standards. Additionally, a review of the evidence-based practices utilized will be conducted to determine if additional training is needed to support teachers in improving student outcomes.

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

For FFY2022, Guam did not meet the target for 3C in Math for High School students with IEPs who participated in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards with its performance of 28.57% (6/21). The reasons for the slippage may be attributed to the Priority Standards, Skills, and Topics (PSSTs) selected by the GDOE for the entire school year. These PSSTs may not have been aligned to the core content standards that are assessed in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

To address the slippage, Guam will engage the teachers of these students in a discussion about how to increase student performance through the review of the PSSTs and the skills assessed in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards as there appears to be a misalignment between these academic standards. Additionally, a review of the evidence-based practices utilized will be conducted to determine if additional training is needed to support teachers in improving student outcomes.

**Regulatory Information**

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

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

The Annual State of Public Education (ASPER) is the public report that contains information on assessment results for all students. The link for the annual reports is as follows:

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

It should be noted, however, that for SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment to all its students. As of this report writing, the SY2022-2023 ASPER has not been posted on the GDOE website.

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

For SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment for all students. Data is not available for students without disabilities who participated in the district-wide assessment. Additionally, there is no data available for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment with or without accommodations.

Guam administered the district-wide assessment for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. Data for these students with IEPs are reported in the assessment files and is prepopulated for Indicator 3C.

Guam sought guidance from OSEP regarding the submission of assessment files 175, 178, 185 and 188. The instructions OSEP provided include the following:

For the participation data files, ensure all children with disabilities who were enrolled during the testing window are accounted in 185 and 188. Those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should be reported under the permitted value for non-participants (NPART) in the assessment participation data files.

Additionally, for the participation data files, enter -1 for the regular with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGPARTWOACC & REGPARTWACC; for high school: PHSRGASMIWOACC & PHSRGASMIWACC ).

For the performance data files, those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should NOT be reported in files 175 and 178.

Additionally, please report -1 for the Regular assessment with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGASSWOACC & REGASSWACC; for high school: HSREGASMTIWOACC & HSREGASMTIWACC).

### **3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3C - OSEP Response**

### **3C - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	11.50	11.00	10.50	10.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	15.50	15.00	14.50	14.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	6.20	6.00	5.80	5.60
Math	A <=	Grade 4	3.40	3.20	3.00	2.80
Math	B <=	Grade 8	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	1.65	1.45	1.25	1.05

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator “clusters,” such

as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.

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

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.

- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

## **FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

### **Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			18.98	11.50		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			29.83	15.50		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			27.45	6.20		N/A	N/A

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			4.01	3.40		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			10.50	1.65		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS			8.17	1.65		N/A	N/A

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

For SY2022-2023, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for all students. Data is not available for students without disabilities who participated in the district-wide assessment. Additionally, there is no data available for students with disabilities whose IEPs state participation in the district-wide assessment with or without accommodations.

Guam sought guidance from OSEP regarding the submission of assessment files 175, 178, 185 and 188. The instructions OSEP provided include the following:

For the participation data files, ensure all children with disabilities who were enrolled during the testing window are accounted in 185 and 188. Those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should be reported under the permitted value for non-participants (NPART) in the assessment participation data files.

Additionally, for the participation data files, enter -1 for the regular with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGPARTWOACC & REGPARTWACC; for high school: PHSRGASMIWOACC & PHSRGASMIWACC ).

For the performance data files, those students who should have participated in the regular assessment with and without accommodations but were not assessed using the Smarter Balanced assessment should NOT be reported in files 175 and 178.

Additionally, please report -1 for the Regular assessment with and without accommodations permitted values (for grades 3-8: REGASSWOACC & REGASSWACC; for high school: HSREGASMTIWOACC & HSREGASMTIWACC).

Beginning School Year 23-24, the GDOE will administer the following District-wide Assessments: Smarter Balanced Assessments and the Multi-State Alternate Assessment for students in grades 3 through 8 and 11 in Spring of each year. Complete assessment data for IND 3 will be reported in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

### 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 3D - OSEP Response

Guam did not administer its regular Statewide assessment during the reporting period, to children with or without disabilities, and could not provide data under this indicator. As a result, OSEP could not determine whether Guam met its targets.

### 3D - Required Actions

Guam did not provide data for FFY 2022. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%



## Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division’s Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific “clusters” of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long “Boot Camp” training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam’s performance in each of the indicators, and the “story” behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a “welcome back” session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has

with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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 2021-2022 was 1682 students. The enrollment data for students without disabilities for this same school year was 24,937.

In SY 2021-2022, the number of long-term suspensions or expulsions for students with disabilities equaled 52 students based on the IDEA 618 discipline reported data; the number of long-term suspensions or expulsions for students without disabilities was 296 based on the GDOE student data system.

For this reporting year and using the SY 2021-2022 data described above, 3.09% (52/1682) of students with disabilities and 1.19% (296/24,937) of students without disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, respectively. Significant discrepancy is determined when children with disabilities have long term suspension and expulsion at a rate three times that of children without disabilities. Thus  $1.19\% \times 3 = 3.57\%$ .

Based on the data provided, along with using Guam's definition of "significant discrepancy," Guam Part B met the target for Indicator 4A for this FFY APR reporting period using the one-year lag data.

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

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

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

For FFY 2022, Guam did not report a "significant discrepancy." Thus, for FFY 2022, 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)

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 2021

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 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response****4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

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

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

**4B- Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=		44.50%	44.55%	42.06%	43.00%
A	42.06%	Data	44.21%	44.72%	41.27%	42.06%	38.86%
B	2020	Target <=		3.50%	3.45%	3.89%	3.75%
B	3.89%	Data	3.79%	2.75%	2.75%	3.89%	2.78%
C	2020	Target <=		0.10%	0.09%	0.12%	0.10%
C	0.12%	Data	0.11%	0.17%	0.12%	0.12%	0.06%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.

- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	1,583
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	608

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	38
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) 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 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	608	1,583	38.86%	43.50%	38.41%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	38	1,583	2.78%	3.75%	2.40%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2	1,583	0.06%	0.10%	0.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

As part of its improvement activities, the GDOE Division of Special Education assigned personnel from its Leadership Team to act as Liaisons to school regions. Part of the responsibilities the Liaisons carry out includes, but is not limited to, technical assistance to school personnel with all matters in the provision of services to students with disabilities and their families.

The Division also has SPED Coaches who assist in the technical assistance and training and support with their assigned schools. Most of the technical assistance, training and support provided are IEP stipulated and may include supporting the teaching and intervention strategies teachers would use in the provision of specially designed instruction for students with IEPs in their least restrictive environment.

#### 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 5 - OSEP Response

#### 5 - Required Actions



## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

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

NO

#### Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	64.00%	66.00%	66.50%	38.64%	39.00%
A	Data	63.47%	52.35%	60.81%	38.64%	41.18%
B	Target <=	10.00%	9.00%	8.50%	18.18%	18.00%
B	Data	5.39%	11.41%	20.27%	18.18%	29.41%
C	Target <=				43.18%	42.00%
C	Data				43.18%	29.41%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held

virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.

- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.

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

- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.

- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.

- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

## Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	42.00%	45.00%	48.00%	51.00%
Target B <=	17.50%	17.00%	16.50%	16.00%

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	41.00%	40.00%	39.00%	38.00%

**Prepopulated Data**
**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	60	45	11	116
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	25	29	10	64
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3	8	1	12
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	32	8	0	40

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 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	64	116	41.18%	42.00%	55.17%	Met target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	12	116	29.41%	17.50%	10.34%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	40	116	29.41%	41.00%	34.48%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The Division's Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) program personnel have been actively engaged in many of the GDOE activities conducted throughout the school year. There is a strong partnership with GDOE's Head Start program and the Universal Pre-K program. This collaboration has earned more slots in the universal Pre-K program and joint training sessions with personnel from each of the GDOE Offices. The GDOE is also exploring the possibility of creating an early learning unit for all personnel who provide services to young children ages three through five, inclusive of young children with disabilities and their families.

**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 3 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2008	Target >=	85.50%	85.50%	85.50%	70.00%	70.40%
A1	71.00%	Data	70.18%	83.58%	79.31%	91.30%	93.18%

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A2	2008	Target >=	57.50%	57.51%	57.51%	21.28%	30.00%
A2	57.50%	Data	29.51%	23.53%	15.52%	21.28%	9.09%
B1	2008	Target >=	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	80.00%	80.40%
B1	80.00%	Data	75.00%	88.24%	75.86%	95.74%	90.91%
B2	2008	Target >=	47.50%	47.51%	47.51%	6.38%	7.00%
B2	47.50%	Data	27.87%	20.59%	13.79%	6.38%	6.82%
C1	2008	Target >=	89.31%	89.32%	89.32%	89.00%	89.50%
C1	89.30%	Data	59.65%	80.60%	78.95%	91.49%	90.91%
C2	2008	Target >=	70.00%	70.01%	70.01%	21.28%	30.00%
C2	70.00%	Data	32.79%	25.00%	20.69%	21.28%	9.09%

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

## FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

31

#### 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	3.23%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	26	83.87%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	4	12.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	30	31	93.18%	70.80%	96.77%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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>	4	31	9.09%	35.00%	12.90%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1	3.23%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	3.23%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	26	83.87%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	9.68%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	29	31	90.91%	80.80%	93.55%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3	31	6.82%	10.00%	9.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1	3.23%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	6.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	23	74.19%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	16.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the	28	31	90.91%	90.00%	90.32%	Met target	No Slippage



Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	5	31	9.09%	40.00%	16.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

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

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

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy.

Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

In addition, stakeholder input was gathered to review the FFY 2021 Indicator 8 results and improvement for survey dissemination in FFY 2022. Stakeholders included in the FFY 2022 pre-survey meeting included representatives from the GDOE Special Education Program, Parent Training and Information (PTI) Program, Guam CEDDERS, Autism Community Together (ACT), and parent members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Stakeholder input included reducing the number of survey items, while maintaining the one survey item for reporting Indicator 8 data, and the process for dissemination to include the paper version of the survey and the use a QR code on all surveys and flyers.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	62.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	84.00%	86.00%	86.50%	72.00%	72.00%
Data	71.37%	72.88%			71.06%

#### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	75.00%	78.00%	81.00%	84.00%

#### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
250	350	71.06%	75.00%	71.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

The same process for dissemination and collection was conducted for parents of preschool children with IEPs, as with the school age group. The survey was distributed using a census process where the survey was distributed to every parent with a child receiving special education services. The survey was disseminated to parents of active students with an IEP from preschool to high school. A survey was disseminated to each parent through their child enrolled at either at a GDOE elementary, middle, and/or high school as well as in charter schools. If a parent had more than one child, he/she received only one survey unless the child was enrolled in a different level. [Note: Levels refer to elementary, middle, or high.]

A listing of all Active (A) and Waiting (W) students by school was obtained in March 2023. This list included preschoolers with IEPs in their respective school or district school. All preschoolers with IEPs are assigned to an elementary school within their district of enrollment. The first dissemination involved sending home the IDEA Part B Parent Survey along with a cover letter from the school principal. The surveys were delivered to the parent through his or her child starting in the third week of April 2023. The second dissemination was during the first week of May 2023 for non-respondents of the first dissemination.

Each parent was provided the following options to return the completed survey: return by mail; return to the school principal; return to the Division of Special Education, Parent Services Office; or email to Guam CEDDERS Survey Consultant. Parents were also provided with the opportunity to complete the survey on-line.

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

1,627

#### **Percentage of respondent parents**

21.51%

#### **Response Rate**

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	14.04%	21.51%

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

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

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

Guam Part B reports that the demographics of parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Guam Part B utilized the demographics of race/ethnicity and geographic location to determine representativeness using the +/-3% metric calculation. The race/ethnicity categories in the survey mirrored that of the GDOE race/ethnicity categories within its database. Guam Part B utilized the OSEP ethnicity categories reported annually to assess ethnicity representation. The analysis reviewed the ethnicity responses in comparison to the Child Count ethnicity data of children with IEPs at the time the surveys were distributed.

Based on the metric used, the Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders and Two or More ethnicity categories exceeded the +/-3% difference, while the other ethnicity categories were within the +/-3% difference. The Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander ethnicity category which represents the majority of our island community was considered under-represented with a -23.98% difference. This is similar to the FFY21 survey respondents. The Two or More ethnicity category was over-represented with a 21.80% difference. It should be noted that the data for the respondent group is based on the respondent's selection of their child's ethnicity at the time of completing the survey.

Further analysis was done with the demographics of the on-line respondents by ethnicity. The majority of the on-line respondents were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders. Of the completed on-line surveys, 58.33% (63/108) were completed by Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders. The second largest group was respondents that identified their ethnicity as Two or More with 13.87% (15/108) of respondents.

The analysis by geographic location resulted in at least one respondent, either through submission of the paper version or online version, from each of the 19 villages. Most of the respondents by location were within the +/-3% difference, with the exception of Mangilao, Tamuning-Tumon-Harmon, and Yigo reporting underrepresentation with a difference of -5.17% and overrepresentation at 3.80% and 3.78% respectively.

Additional analysis of the on-line survey respondents by geographic location indicated there were respondents from every village, with the exception of three villages, two in the southern part and one in the central part of the island. The majority were from the villages of Dededo and Yigo, the two largest villages in the northern part of the island.

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

NO

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

For FFY 2022, Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 8 was 21.51% (350/1627). Although 374 surveys were received, 350 of the surveys had valid responses for the Indicator 8 measure.

The analysis of the method of responding indicated that decreasing the number of items on the survey and providing the opportunity to access and complete the survey on-line through the use of an QR Code increased the response rate by over 7%. A total of 374 surveys were received; of which 108 or 28.88% of the surveys were completed on-line with the remaining surveys completed with the hard copy of the survey. This is an increase of over 400% for on-line surveys. In previous years, a link was provided on the survey, as well as emailed to parents as requested. For the FFY2022 survey, two revisions were made which may have accounted for the increase in completing surveys on-line, as recommended by the pre-survey focus group. One was decreasing the number of survey items to nine items, while maintaining the same item for the Indicator 8 measure. The other revision was providing a QR code to complete the survey on the survey and flyers, instead of upon request as in previous years.

To address the groups that were underrepresented, efforts will be made to ensure the demographic data collected for each eligible child with a disability are truly reflective of the child's ethnicity which may include two or more ethnicities. Guam Part B will continue to collaborate with the ACT organization that serves as the Guam PTI program to engage families in responding to the survey. The Guam PTI program activities are opportunities to meet with families to gather information on how best to hear from parents about parental involvement. The Guam Part B OSEP-funded State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo'na utilizes the Leading by Convening framework for engaging families and providers in improving the professional and family learning opportunities for increasing literacy skills of children with disabilities. The SPDG activities facilitate increasing parent engagement, which will serve as a means for increased parental involvement and responses to the survey.

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

To address the groups that were underrepresented, efforts will be made to ensure the demographic data collected for each eligible child with a disability are truly reflective of the child's ethnicity which may include two or more ethnicities. Guam Part B will continue to collaborate with the ACT organization that serves as the Guam PTI program to engage families in responding to the survey. The Guam PTI program activities are opportunities to meet with families to gather information on how best to hear from parents about parental involvement. The Guam Part B OSEP-funded State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG): Project Hita Para Mo'na utilizes the Leading by Convening framework for engaging families and providers in improving the professional and family learning opportunities for increasing literacy skills of children with disabilities. The SPDG activities facilitate increasing parent engagement, which will serve as a means for increased parental involvement and responses to the survey.

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

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

All schools and programs were represented in the surveys returned. As discussed earlier, the OSEP ethnicity categories were represented in the returned surveys with two ethnicity categories reporting underrepresentation or overrepresentation. The returned surveys represented all locations or villages, with three villages reporting underrepresentation or overrepresentation.

The methods used for disseminating the surveys included a paper version provided to the parents via their child with an IEP and the online version. Flyers announcing the survey were also disseminated and made available through the schools, programs, and social media.

With the analysis of the response rate and dissemination processes, which included stakeholder input on the survey items and methods for dissemination, Guam Part B did not identify any nonresponse bias in FFY 2022. Guam Part B will continue to convene the stakeholders, including the GAPSD and Guam PTI, to review the results of the survey, including dissemination methods, to increase the response rate and address the under/over representation.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

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

None

## **8 - OSEP Response**

## **8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

#### Instructions

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

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

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

YES

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

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

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 9 - Required Actions

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 10 - Required Actions





## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	93.42%	96.58%	84.98%	77.73%	83.77%

### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
310	224	83.77%	100%	72.26%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage**

The reasons for the slippage in performance with this compliance indicator stem from the following:

(1) Guam was severely impacted by Super Typhoon Mawar that occurred in May 2023. The entire island was devastated with no source of power, water, and forms of communication for several months. A total of 26 student referrals were affected by this natural disaster. This situation was also compounded with the requirements imposed by legislation whereby schools had to pass the Department of Public Health inspections before they were allowed to open its doors to the public. A domino effect was created with reference to individuals who were available to assess, places in which assessments could take place, and the ability to contact families so they could bring their child to designated sites to conduct evaluations.

(2) Guam Part B continues to have challenges with the number of personnel available to conduct evaluations in the following referral areas: psychoeducational evaluations, Occupational Therapy, autism, speech/language, and emotional disabilities.

As an update, Guam Part B completes and submits a Quarterly Special Conditions Program Progress Report as part of its Comprehensive Correction Action Plan (CCAP) as a result of the special conditions imposed on the Guam Department of Education. For the cumulative reporting period of 7/1/2023 - 12/31/2023, performance data for Indicator 11 was 81.32% (148/182). This increase could be attributed to the continued weekly monitoring of the evaluations by Division Program Leads after reviewing the weekly Indicator 11 reports generated by the Division Data Office.

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

86

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

Of the 310 parental consents received, 224 were evaluated within the 60-Day time-line. There are 86 children to report in the "Account For" category described below:

- 36 students were evaluated within 1-30 days after the 60-Day timeline; the reasons for delay are attributed to program delays.
- 27 students were evaluated within 31-60 days after the 60-Day timeline; the reasons for delay are attributed to program delays.
- 12 students were evaluated within 61-90 days after the 60-Day timeline; the reasons for delay are attributed to program delays.
- 11 students were evaluated within 91+ days after the 60-Day timeline; the reasons for delay are attributed to program delays.

Although late, all 86 children have been evaluated with eligibility meetings held for all 86 students.

This information was confirmed through a report generated by the Division's Data Office as of January 30, 2024.

**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 procedures 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 signed parent consent form is received by school personal or the designated case manager. This "receipt of parental consent" is what initiates the 60-Day Timeline.

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

Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) 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 evaluations in their designated Units. This weekly monitoring process was developed to ensure all Units are kept abreast of any referrals that may have been missed or not submitted to the respective evaluator in a timely manner.

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

It should also be noted that the SOP for evaluations has been revised to include stronger accountability measures that will be taken with personnel who were responsible for the program delay in evaluations.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2013	3	0	3

**FFY 2013**

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021:

In FFY 2021, Indicator 11 performance was 83.77% (258/308) compliance with the 60-day initial evaluation timeline. As described in the FFY 2021 APR, by the end of the reporting year, there were 50 initial evaluations that were completed over the 60-day timeline. These individual instances of 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 2021 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 2022 for not being able to demonstrate correct implementation of the 60-day timeline requirement at 100% compliance through the review of updated/subsequent data from the Division Indicator 11 data reports, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

In July 2023, CMO reported the three findings of noncompliance remained "not yet verified as corrected" because the Division was unable to demonstrate correct implementation of the Child Find compliance requirements for subsequent initial evaluations. The CMO described that subsequent data for initial evaluations in the FFY 2022 reporting period through June 30, 2023 continued to report noncompliance with the initial evaluation timeline requirement, as reflected in the FFY 2022 Indicator 11 performance data.

As described in the FFY 2022 Indicator Data section, Guam reported slippage with their Indicator 11 performance from the previous year. The 86 individual instances of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2022 Indicator 11 performance were completed but over timeline. Guam shared the impact of Super Typhoon Mawar in May 2023, which affected the timely completion of 30% (26/86) of the initial evaluations. In addition, the legislative mandate requiring schools to pass the Department of Public Health inspections before they can open their doors added to the challenges already imposed by the aftermath of Super Typhoon Mawar. Challenges faced by the Division included identifying individuals who were available to assess, places in which assessments could take place, and the ability to contact families so they could bring their child to designated sites to conduct evaluations.

Actions Taken to Address Noncompliance:

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

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

(2) On a monthly basis, the Compliance Monitoring Office submits a compliance report on behalf of the Superintendent of Education to the Guam Education Board (GEB). The data in these reports are reviewed by GEB members and the Division must answer to any questions of noncompliance asked by GEB members, to include any actions taken to address and mitigate the noncompliance.

(3) Weekly reports continue to be generated by the Division Data Office to track the completion of initial evaluations. Each Division Program Lead is responsible for monitoring the completion of all evaluations in their designated areas. The Program Leads are required to respond with an update to the status of each pending evaluation and to determine if additional actions are needed to meet the Indicator 11 timeline requirements.

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

(5) The Division has also revised its standard operating procedures for monitoring the completion of the 60-Day Timeline by adding steps Program Leads will take to hold personnel accountable for any program delays caused by individual(s) assigned to complete evaluations timely. These accountability measures mirror those described in the GDOE Personnel Handbook.

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

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

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that, for each finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each remaining finding identified in FFY 2013, Guam: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Guam Part B provided the response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR in the Indicator 11 Data tab in the section labeled "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 and Actions Taken to Address Noncompliance."

## **11 - OSEP Response**

Under reasons for slippage for this indicator, Guam reported on the impact of Typhoon Mawar on its ability to perform evaluations within 60 days of receiving parental consent during FFY 2022. Specifically, Guam reported that "the entire island was devastated with no source of power, water, and forms of communication for several months."

Guam did not demonstrate that the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected because Guam did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Specifically, Guam did not report that it verified the correction of each finding of noncompliance for this indicator identified in FFY 2018 and that Guam is: (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 SEA data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction.

## **11 - Required Actions**

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining three (3) uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

## 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

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	93
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	15

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	59
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.	19
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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	59	59	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

0

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

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

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

Reporting period 7/1/2022 to 6/30/2023:

There were 93 children served in Part C who were referred to Part B for eligibility. Of these 93 children: 15 were determined not eligible before their 3rd birthday; and 59 were found eligible and had their IEPs developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday.

Additionally, the following is reported:

- There are nineteen (19) children to report in Measurement "D":
  - o Fifteen (15) families refused services;
  - o Three (3) families moved off-island; and
  - o One (1) family continued to be a no show for services and eventually became difficult to locate.

There are no (0) children to report in Measurement "E," the number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday; and there are no (0) children to report in the 'Account For' category.

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

Based on cumulative data for reporting period July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023 Guam Part B has met the 100% compliance target for Indicator 12. It should be noted that Guam Part B has met this compliance indicator from FFY 2008 through FFY 2022. The Part B Program Coordinator will continue to monitor and implement the Improvement Activities developed for this Indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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 2021**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**12 - OSEP Response****12 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.21%	97.32%	83.40%	91.12%	94.80%

### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
373	457	94.80%	100%	81.62%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

For FFY 2022, Guam did not meet the compliance target for Indicator 13 with its performance of 81.62% (373/457). This performance also represented slippage from the FFY 2021 performance of 94.80%. The reasons for the slippage could be attributed to:

84 students with IEPs whose transition plans did not meet the Indicator 13 requirements. Data drill down activities to determine the root cause of the slippage revealed the following:

- 67 students had current IEPs with transition plans that did not have evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.
- 17 students did not have current IEPs and the transition plans did not meet the requirements for Indicator 13. The IEP meetings for these 17 students were impacted by Super Typhoon Mawar which devastated the island in May 2023. IEP meetings were scheduled but could not be held due to no power, water and reliable sources of communication to many parts of the island.

The aftermath of the Super Typhoon, along with the Department of Public Health sanitary permits mandated for all GDOE schools expired in June 30, 2023. This mandate forced GDOE schools to close its doors until they could be inspected before being allowed to become fully operational.

As an update, Guam Part B completes and submits a Quarterly Special Conditions Program Progress Report as part of its Comprehensive Correction Action Plan (CCAP) as a result of the special conditions imposed on the Guam Department of Education. For the cumulative reporting period of 7/1/2023 - 12/31/2023, performance data for students with IEPs aged 16 and above whose IEPs meet Indicator 13 requirements was 84.82% (352/415). This increase could be attributed to two out of the six high schools who performed at 100% for Indicator 13. In addition, as of December 31, 2023, the status of the 84 students whose IEPs did not contain the required components for secondary transition in order to meet Indicator 13 requirements for the FFY 2022 reporting period is as follows:

- 35 out of the 84 have IEPs now have the required components for secondary transition;
- 32 out of the 84 do not have IEPs with the required components for secondary transition; and
- 17 out of the 84 are no longer within jurisdiction.

Division personnel will continue the targeted technical assistance to each of the six high schools, with more intensive technical assistance provided to particular high schools who are challenged with meeting this compliance indicator.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5			5

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected****Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) is responsible for monitoring and verifying correct implementation of the Indicator 13 regulatory requirements. CMO reviews Indicator 13 school data reports on a quarterly basis and provides written notification of the status of the correction of noncompliance.

In June 2022, CMO conducted off-site monitoring for Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. CMO issued a written notification of findings of noncompliance to two high schools. One high school was issued one finding and another high school four findings. These five individual instances of noncompliance were part of the noncompliance data in the FFY 2021 Indicator 13 noncompliance data.

In FFY 2021, Guam reported 94.80% (456/481) compliance with Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. The 25 individual cases of noncompliance included the five findings of noncompliance issued to the two high schools in June 2022 and subsequent data for the one high school issued findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

Consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, CMO verifies correction of noncompliance through a quarterly review of Indicator 13 school data reports. Verified correction of noncompliance includes the high schools demonstrating (1) correct implementation of Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements at 100% compliance based on a review of updated data in the quarterly Indicator 13 data report; and (2) correction of each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the high school, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In October 2022, the CMO verified that the five individual cases of noncompliance issued to the two high schools were corrected or out of the school's jurisdiction through a review of the Indicator 13 school data report. CMO continued to monitor updated/subsequent Indicator 13 data for the two high schools for verified correction at 100% compliance of updated data.

In October 2023 and January 2024, the CMO issued continued "failure to correct" notices to the two high schools as they were not able to demonstrate 100% compliance of updated/subsequent data with the Indicator 13 secondary requirements. The updated noncompliance data were part of the FFY 2022 Indicator 13 noncompliance data.

As reported in the FFY 2022 Indicator 13 performance data, Guam Part B reported 81.62% (373/457) compliance with Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. The 84 individual instances of noncompliance included the updated/subsequent data for the three high schools issued findings in FFY 2018 and FFY 2021.

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected:

To address the continued noncompliance of the two high schools issued findings in FFY 2021, GDOE actions taken to correct the noncompliance include:

(1) Schools are required to submit to CMO a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to address their noncompliance cases, as well as to account for any upcoming cases that would be reviewed as part of their subsequent data. The CAP must indicate the timelines for the school and CMO to monitor their progress towards compliance;

(2) CMO reviewing the school data reports on a quarterly basis and providing written notification of the status of each school's correction of noncompliance; and

(3) Beginning school year 2023-2024, CMO submits monthly compliance reports on behalf of the Superintendent of Education to the Guam Education Board (GEB). The data in these reports are reviewed by GEB members and the Division and schools must answer to any questions of noncompliance asked by GEB members, to include any actions taken to address and mitigate the noncompliance.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	27	0	27

#### FFY 2018

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

##### Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

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

In the June 2020 "failure to correct" memorandum, the CMO acknowledged the correction of the 27 individual instances of noncompliance, which were the findings of noncompliance issued to the high school in FFY 2018. CMO verified that the 27 individual instances were corrected through a review of the school data report.

In June 2022, CMO verified subsequent correction of noncompliance through a review of the Indicator 13 school data report. The June 2022 verification memorandum indicated that the high school did not meet the verified correction of the noncompliance requirement based on the subsequent data reviewed not meeting 100% compliance. The subsequent noncompliance data were part of the FFY 2021 Indicator 13 noncompliance performance data.

In October 2023 and January 2024, CMO issued a continued "failure to correct" notice to the high school for not being able to demonstrate 100% compliance of updated/subsequent data with the Indicator 13 secondary requirements. The updated noncompliance data were part of the FFY 2022 Indicator 13 noncompliance data and the Guam Part B Quarterly Special Conditions Program Progress Report as part of its Comprehensive Correction Action Plan (CCAP) for the reporting period of 7/1/2023 - 12/31/2023.

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected:

To address the continued noncompliance of the one high school issued findings in FFY 2018, GDOE actions taken to correct the noncompliance include:

(1) GDOE initiating progressive sanctions against the high school principal. The sanctions required the school to provide weekly updates on the status of all IEPs requiring the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements;

(2) School is required to submit to CMO a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to address their noncompliance cases, as well as to account for any upcoming cases that would be reviewed as part of their subsequent data. The CAP must indicate the timelines for the school and CMO to monitor their progress towards compliance;

- (3) CMO reviewing the school data reports on a quarterly basis and providing written notification of the status of the school's correction of noncompliance;
- (4) Beginning school year 2022-2023, the high school principal reassigned the supervision of the school's special education services to another vice principal and hired an additional consulting resource teacher or case manager to support the development and review of the IEPs;
- (5) Beginning school year 2022-2023, the Division assigned a special education coach to provide technical support in the school's weekly reviews of IEPs for the required secondary transition requirements; and
- (6) Beginning school year 2023-2024, CMO submits monthly compliance reports on behalf of the Superintendent of Education to the Guam Education Board (GEB). The data in these reports are reviewed by GEB members and the Division and schools must answer to any questions of noncompliance asked by GEB members, to include any actions taken to address and mitigate the noncompliance.

### **13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 27 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that, for each finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each remaining finding identified in FFY 2018, Guam: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

Guam Part B has provided the Response to Actions required in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR in the Indicator 13 Data tab in the section labeled: Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021, Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021.

### **13 - OSEP Response**

Guam did not demonstrate that the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2018 were corrected because Guam did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Specifically, Guam did not report that that it verified the correction of each finding of noncompliance for this indicator identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2018 and that Guam is: (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 SEA data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction.

### **13 - Required Actions**

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining five (5) uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and the 27 remaining findings from FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022, FFY 2021, and FFY 2018 were corrected and that 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 SEA data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

#### II. Data Reporting

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

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target ≥	20.00%	21.00%	21.00%	10.53%	11.00%
A	11.00%	Data	23.19%	16.67%	14.77%	10.53%	8.75%
B	2009	Target ≥	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	52.63%	54.00%
B	51.00%	Data	66.67%	62.75%	64.77%	52.63%	53.75%
C	2009	Target ≥	70.00%	71.00%	71.00%	53.95%	55.00%
C	60.00%	Data	68.12%	72.55%	65.91%	53.95%	55.00%

### FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	11.50%	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%
Target B ≥	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%
Target C ≥	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator “clusters,” such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).

- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	128
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	34
Response Rate	26.56%

1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	3
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	17
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	0
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	3	34	8.75%	11.50%	8.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	20	34	53.75%	55.00%	58.82%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	20	34	55.00%	56.00%	58.82%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

**Response Rate**

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	68.97%	26.56%

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

Guam Part B used the 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 2021-2022.

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.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**



Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group of the characteristics of: (a) disability type; (b) ethnicity; (c) gender; and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2021-2022. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of plus/minus 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, the color red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a plus/minus 3% interval.

For FFY 2022, there were a total number of 128 Leavers. Of the 128 Leavers, 34 responded to the post-school outcomes survey. The response rate for this reporting period was 26.56% (34/128) which is a noticeable decline from last year's response rate of 68.97% (80/116).

For FFY 2022, there were a total number of 128 Leavers. Of the 128 Leavers, 34 responded to the post-school outcomes survey. In reviewing the race/ethnicity of the total Leaver population, 17.97% (23/128) represented the Asian population and 81.25% (104/128) represented the Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander population. Upon review of the respondents, 26.47% (9/34) represented the respondents who were of Asian descent, while 70.69% (24/34) represented the respondents who were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Using the plus/minus 3% interval when determining the over-representativeness or under-representativeness for race/ethnicity, there does appear to be an over-representativeness and under-representativeness when analyzing the race/ethnicity data for the respondents and non-respondents for the Leavers who fall under Asian or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander categories, respectively. The race/ethnicity demographic data for youth who responded to the post-school outcomes survey and who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school are not representative of this population. The percentages exceed the plus/minus 3% interval.

Stakeholders also agreed to review data representing the disability categories of the Leaver population based on the results of the NTACT Response Calculator. For FFY 2022, the NTACT Response Calculator revealed the respondents were slightly under-represented in the specific learning disability category by -0.51%. The NTACT calculator revealed 70.59% (24/34) of the respondent population represented individuals with a specific learning disability. If the entire SLD population responded to the post-school outcomes survey, the total SLD population would have represented 71.09% (91/128) of the total Leaver population. The other disability categories such as emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities, and all other disabilities were also reviewed. The NTACT Calculator showed an under-representativeness for the intellectual disability category whereby 5.47% (7/128) represented the Target Leaver population and 2.94% (1/34) represented the Response Leaver population. This is a representative difference of -2.53%. Additionally, the "all other" disability category was over-represented with a positive difference of 3.03%. 23.44% (30/128) represented the Target Leaver population, while 20.59% (9/34) represented the Response Leaver population. This percentage exceeds the plus/minus 3% interval.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

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

Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 14 for FFY 2022 was 26.56%. This means that of the 128 students who left school last year, post-school outcome information was not available for 73.44% (n = 94) of the Leavers who exited the Guam Department of Education. This FFY 2022 response rate is a decline of 42.41% from last year's response rate of 68.97% for Indicator 14.

The decreased response rate may be attributed to the aftermath of Super Typhoon Mawar which devastated the island in May 2023. Many island residents were without power, water, and a means of communication for several months. Division personnel were challenged with contacting the Leavers during the months of May through September, which is the period in which the post-school outcomes survey was conducted for this FFY 2022 reporting period.

As previously reported, post-school outcomes surveys were sent out through the mail using the home addresses on file. Many of the surveys mailed out came back with a "Return to Sender" message. Other attempts to contact the Leavers included contacting them through phone or social media such as Facebook and Instagram, whenever connectivity was available. As in previous years, many of the phone numbers on record were either disconnected or no longer in service. Although contacts were made with some Leavers via the social media, the Leavers did not respond to requests made for them to contact Division personnel.

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

- Before leaving or graduating from school, the demographics are updated.
- Ensure demographics are updated periodically within the year before leaving high school.
- Continue alternative social media methods, such as Facebook and Instagram

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

Guam Part B's response rate for Indicator 14 for FFY 2022 is 26.56%. This means that of the 128 students who left school last year, post school outcome information was not available for 73.44% (n=94) of the Leavers who exited the Guam Department of Education. This FFY 2022 response rate is a decrease (42.41%) from last year's response rate of 68.97% (80/116) for Indicator 14.

Initially in April 2023, surveys were sent out through the mail using the home addresses on file. Personnel from the Division of Special Education's Transition Office found it quite challenging as many of the surveys mailed out came back with a "Return to Sender" message. Other attempts to contact the Leavers included contacting them through phone or through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram, whenever connectivity was available. Many of the phone numbers on record were either disconnected or no longer in service; and although contacts were made with some Leavers via social media, the Leavers did not respond to requests made for them to contact Division personnel.

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

- Before leaving or graduating from school, work with Leavers to get updated demographics such as phone numbers or email addresses;
- At least twice during the school year, ensure the demographics are updated before students exit high school; and
- Continue alternative social media methods, such as FaceBook and InstaGram.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Guam Part B used the NTACT Response Calculator to calculate representativeness of the respondent group of the characteristics of: (a) disability type; (b) ethnicity; (c) gender; and (d) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to or different from the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2021-2022. According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of plus/minus 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, the color red is used to indicate a difference exceeding a plus/minus 3% interval.

For FFY 2022, there were a total number of 128 Leavers. Of the 128 Leavers, 34 responded to the post-school outcomes survey. In reviewing the race/ethnicity of the total Leaver population, 17.97% (23/128) represented the Asian population and 81.25% (104/128) represented the Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander population. Upon review of the respondents, 26.47% (9/34) represented the respondents who were of Asian descent, while 70.69% (24/34) represented the respondents who were of Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander descent. Using the plus/minus 3% interval when determining the over-representativeness or under-representativeness for race/ethnicity, there appears to be an over-representativeness and under-representativeness when analyzing the race/ethnicity data for the respondents and non-respondents for the Leavers who fall under Asian or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander categories, respectively. The race/ethnicity demographic data for youth who responded to the post-school outcomes survey and who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school are not representative of this population.

Additionally, for FFY 2022, Guam reports that its respondents are not representative of the 2021-2022 leaver population based on data reported in the NTACT Response Calculator; specifically, the respondents were slightly under-represented in the specific learning disability category and intellectual disability category. FFY 2022 data also showed no representativeness in the emotional disability and an over-representativeness exceeding the plus/minus 3% interval in the "all other disability" category.

The NTACT calculator revealed 70.59% (24/34) of the respondent population represented individuals with a specific learning disability. If the entire SLD leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, the total SLD population would have represented 71.09% (91/128) of the total Leaver population; hence the slight under-representativeness of -0.51% of leavers who have a specific learning disability. The other disability categories of emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities, and all other disabilities were also reviewed. The NTACT Calculator showed no representativeness for emotional disabilities as there were no leavers who fell under this disability category; a -2.53% difference for the intellectual disability category which represents under-representativeness, with 5.47% (7/128) representing the Target Leaver population and 2.94% (1/34) representing the Respondent Leaver population; and an over-representativeness by 3.03% in the "all other disability" category, with 23.44% (30/128) representing the Respondent Leaver population, while 26.47% (9/34) represented the Respondent Leaver population. This 3.03% difference exceeds the plus/minus 3% interval as noted in the NTACT calculator.

Furthermore, based on the NTACT Response Calculator, there was an under-representation in the Target and Respondent Leaver population who exited the system by dropping out of school, by -8.59% (0/34), as there were no respondents who represented the Drop Out category. This difference also exceeds the plus/minus 3% interval.

The steps Guam Part B will take to reduce any identified bias and to promote responses from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the same time they left school continue to be through the updates of demographics before students leave high school and through the use of social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram. It should be noted that this reporting period was unusual as there were many challenges with contacting the Leavers after Super Typhoon Mawar destroyed most of the island. Many families were displaced because of the damage to their homes. Communication was also limited as telecommunication carriers had challenges with reestablishing home phone, internet, and cellular services.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

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

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

For FFY 2022, Guam reported on the representativeness of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Guam also reported on the actions taken to address the issue if the demographics were not representative of the youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect by the time they left school.

Guam also included 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.

This information is reported in the section labeled: 14 - Indicator Data.

## **14 - OSEP Response**

### **14 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, Guam must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions Guam is taking to address this issue. Guam must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts 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 and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	6
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with

personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=					
Data	100.00%	50.00%	87.50%	33.33%	100.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=				

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6	6	100.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

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

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Data Table 7: Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B, of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, for reporting year 2022-2023, there were six (6) resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements during FFY 2022.

The resolution sessions were held and resolved through written settlement agreements.

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

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. 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 ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$  divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=					
Data	0.00%				

#### Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=				

#### FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

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

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Data Table 7: Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B, of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, for reporting year 2022-2023, there were no requests for mediations filed during this reporting period.

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

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

Guam reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

##### **A. Data Analysis**

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

##### **B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

#### C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

#### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The Guam Department of Education (GDOE), a unitary educational system, facilitated the development of Guam's FFY 2021 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 7, which reports on the progress of the implementation plan and outcomes developed as the vehicle for improvement in infrastructure development and implementation of evidence-based practices for meeting Guam's SSIP State-Identified Measurable Results (SiMR). In Phase 1 of the SSIP submitted to OSEP on April 1, 2015, Guam identified the following as its SiMR:

There will be an increased percent of students with disabilities in the 3rd grade that will be proficient in reading in the four participating schools as measured by the district-wide assessment.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

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

The links to Guam Part B's current Theory of Action are as follows:

(1) GDOE SPED Webpage: <https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html>

(2) GDOE Part B Theory of Action: <https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/Theory%20of%20Action%20Revised%20FINAL.pdf>

#### Progress toward the SiMR

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).**

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2014	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	5.00%	5.00%	10.00%	10.00%

#### FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Grade 3 IEP Students in Target Schools who Scored Proficient	Grade 3 IEP Students in Target Schools with Valid Scores	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
		0.00%	5.00%		N/A	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.**

For this FFY 2022 APR reporting period, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for all children. As such, data for students with IEPs who participated with and without accommodations in the district-wide assessment is not available. Guam is unable to determine if it has met its target or if there was slippage in meeting its SiMR for Indicator 17.

Data for children with IEPs who participated in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards in Reading and Math is available as Guam administered the alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards during this FFY 2022 APR period. For this reporting period, however, there were no 3rd grade students in the target SSIP schools who participated in an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

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

This section is not applicable as GDOE did not administer the district-wide assessment for all students during SY2022-2023.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Universal Screener: aimswebPlus

**Participation Rates**

The participation rate for all students is determined by dividing the number of students screened in the 4 target schools by the # of enrolled students from the same schools. The participation rate for students with IEPs is determined by dividing the # of students with IEPs screened in the 4 target schools by the number of students with IEPs from the same schools.

All students

Fall (F) '22: 95% (1101/1156)

Winter (W) '23: 99% (1127/1129)

Spring (S) '23: 99% (1107/1110)

Students w/IEPs

F'22: 66% (23/35)

W '23: 81% (48/59)

S '23: 69% (41/59)

**Performance Rates**

Data shows the percent of students performing average & above (26th percentile & above) in Early Literacy (EL) measures for Kindergarten (K), Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) for grades 1st-3rd and Reading Comprehension (RC) for grades 2nd-3rd. The performance rates were determined by calculating the # of students performing at or above the 26th percentile divided by the total # of students screened. Data represents one school year with the same cohort of students.

**K-Initial Sounds (IS)**

All students

F'22: 29% (68/235)

W'23: 51% (130/254)

S'23: Not tested in Spring

Percentage of increase from F'22-W'23 of students with improved proficiency: 27%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 8% (1/12)

W'23: 24% (4/17)

S'23: Not tested in Spring

Percentage of increase from F'22-W'23 of students with improved proficiency: 200%

**K-Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)**

All Students

F'22: 34% (79/235)

W'23: 55% (139/254)

S'23: 61% (159/260)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: 79%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 25% (3/12)

W'23: 24% (4/17)

S'23: 24% (4/17)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: -4%

**1st-ORF**

All Students

F'22: 30% (101/332)

W'23: 39% (133/345)

S'23: 40% (133/331)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: 33%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 20% (1/5)  
 W'23: 33% (3/9)  
 S'23: 20% (1/5)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: 0%  
 2nd-ORF  
 All Students  
 F'22: 31% (75/240)  
 W'23: 34% (84/244)  
 S'23: 41% (101/244)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: 32%  
 Students with IEPs  
 F'22: 0% (0/7)  
 W'23: 0% (0/12)  
 S'23: 9% (1/11)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: increase of 9  
 2nd-RC  
 All Students  
 F'22: 79% (187/238)  
 W'23: 27% (65/244)  
 S'23: 43% (106/244)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: -45%  
 Students with IEPs  
 F'22: 86% (6/7)  
 W'23: 0% (0/12)  
 S'23: 18% (2/11)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: -79%  
 3rd-ORF  
 All Students  
 F'22: 35% (98/281)  
 W'23: 49% (141/286)  
 S'23: 46% (127/275)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: 31%  
 Students with IEPs  
 F'22: 0 % (0/8)  
 W'23: 0% (0/12)  
 S'23: 0% (0/8)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: 0%  
 3rd-RC  
 All Students  
 F'22: 59% (165/279)  
 W'23: 36% (103/286)  
 S'23: 46% (127/275)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: -22%  
 Students with IEPs  
 F'22: 0% (0/8)  
 W'23: 0% (0/12)  
 S'23: 0/5 (0/8)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23 of students with improved proficiency: 0%:

Benchmark data shows the percent of students performing at or above the 35th percentile in EL measures and the 45th percentile in Reading measures. The 35th & 45th percentiles demonstrate aimswebPlus' success probability target scores. Students scoring at these target benchmarks have an 80% or more likelihood of passing the 3rd grade district assessment. The performance rates were determined by calculating the # of students performing at or above the 35th or 45th percentile divided by the total # of students screened.

K-Initial Sounds (IS)  
 All students  
 F'22:23% (54/235)  
 W'23: 41% (103/254)  
 S'23: Not tested in Spring  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-W'23: 78%  
 Students with IEPs  
 F'22:8% (1/12)  
 W'23: 29% 95/17)  
 S'23: Not tested in Spring  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 262%  
 K-Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)  
 All Students  
 F'22:23% (54/235)  
 W'23: 43% (109//254)  
 S'23: 32% (89/275)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 39%  
 Students with IEPs  
 F'22:25% (3/12)  
 W'23: 24% (4/17)  
 S'23: 24% (4/17)  
 Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: -4%  
 1st-ORF

All Students

F'22: 23% (75/332)

W'23: 28% (95/345)

S'23: 30% (99/331)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 30%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 20% (1/5)

W'23: 11% (1/9)

S'23: 20% (1/5)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 0%

2nd-ORF

All Students

F'22: 19% (45/240)

W'23: 19% (47/244)

S'23: 21% (51/244)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 11%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 0% (0/7)

W'23: 8% (1/12)

S'23: 9% (1/11)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: increase by 9

2nd-RC

All Students

F'22: 31% (73/238)

W'23: 26% (65/244)

S'23: 27% (66/244)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: -12%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 14% (1/7)

W'23: 0% (0/12)

S'23: 9% (1/11)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: -35%

3rd-ORF

All Students

F'22: 17% (48/281)

W'23: 31% (89/286)

S'23: 32% (89/275)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 88%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 0% (0/8)

W'23: 0% (0/12)

S'23: 0% (0/8)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 0%

3rd-RC

All Students

F'22: 33% (93/279)

W'23: 36% (103/286)

S'23: 32% (89/275)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: -3%

Students with IEPs

F'22: 0% (0/8)

W'23: 0% (0/12)

S'23: 0% (0/8)

Percentage of increase from F'22-S'23: 0%

In summary, the secondary data from the screener indicates growth in specific areas. Growth is determined by calculating the percentage of increase in the number of students who demonstrated improvement from the initial screener in F'22 to the last screener of the school year in S'23. For all students, the following areas showed significant increases in the percentage of students who were average (26th percentile) and above:

K: 27% increase in IS

79% increase in LNF

1st: 33% increase in ORF

2nd: 32% increase in ORF

3rd: 31% increase in ORF

For students with IEPs, the following areas showed increases in the percentage of students with IEPs who were average and above:

K: 200% increase in IS

2nd: increase of 9

3rd: increase of 9

For all students, the following areas showed growth in the percentage of students who were at benchmark (35th for Early Literacy measures and 45th percentile in Reading measures) and above:

K: 78% increase in IS

39% increase in LNF

1st: 30% increase in ORF  
2nd: 11% increase in ORF  
3rd: 88% increase in ORF

For students with IEPs, the following areas showed increases in the percentage of students who were at benchmark and above:  
K: 262% in IS  
2nd: increase of 9

Overall, there continues to be a gap in performance between all students and students with IEPs. This trend reveals strong growth in early grades (K-2) but the trend flattens by 3rd grade with little to no improvement demonstrated. Hence, GDOE addresses this gap through targeted coaching, monthly observations, and weekly monitoring of lesson progress for resource room teachers in the SSIP schools.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**  
NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**  
NO

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

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

The links to Guam Part B's current Evaluation Plan are as follows:

GDOE SPED Webpage: <https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education/1874-State-Performance-Plan-and-Annual-Performance-Report.html>

and

GDOE SSIP Evaluation Plan:

[https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/Guam%20Part%20B%20SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan%20\(updated%202\\_1\\_2023\).pdf](https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/Guam%20Part%20B%20SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan%20(updated%202_1_2023).pdf)

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

NO

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

The SSIP Logic Model (LM) provided the framework for how support was provided to the participating schools to improve infrastructure at the district and school levels. Each of the outcomes in the LM was aligned with the Coherent Improvement Strategies (CIS) in the Theory of Action (TOA). Each outcome is supported by activities that demonstrate how the LM is implemented. The TOA, which is linked in this report, demonstrates the connection between the CIS to the goals of the SSIP. The following details each CIS, the corresponding outcomes from the LM and the related activities. Please note that these activities are ongoing from the last reporting period:

CIS: Infrastructure improvement strategies that will guide the development and implementation of specific activities that support the achievement of SSIP goals

Outcomes: Targets in the SSIP LM that define the success of each CIS

Activities: The specific steps related to the CIS that were implemented to achieve the SSIP goals

CIS #1: Improvement Science

Short-term Outcome: Administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches at SSIP schools have increased knowledge in improvement science.

Intermediate Outcomes:

Administrators and teachers implement PDSA cycles as designed and modify as needed.

Teachers have increased knowledge in data-based decision making.

Long-Term Outcome: SiMR

Activities:

Professional Learning (PL) sessions on PDSAs, data literacy, data-based decision making, and EBPs

Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener

Observations and feedback on classroom PDSAs and EBPs

CIS #2: Families and Community as Partners

Short-Term Outcome: Administrators and teachers at SSIP schools have increased knowledge and skills in implementing evidence-based family engagement strategies to support improved reading.

Intermediate Outcomes:

SSIP schools are implementing family engagement strategies for improving reading.

Families reported that they are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home and in the community.

Long-Term Outcome: SiMR

Activities:

Leveraging State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) work team sessions to include SSIP principals, an SSIP teacher, and SSIP parents

SPDG Leading by Convening trainers include an SSIP principal, teacher, and parent

GAPSD-considered Guam's Part B "broad" stakeholder group of individuals who provide input, suggestions, and recommendations for improving special education and related services for children with disabilities on Guam. One of the SSIP Core Team members is also a GAPSD member and a GEB member who shares information with the panel and board members, respectively.

School-based activities with families to foster engagement were conducted to include family reading workshops, monthly newsletter with reading strategies for families,

CIS #3: Professional Learning (PL)

Short-Term Outcome: PL policy and procedures were developed that encompassed research-based practices and elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.

Intermediate Outcomes:

PL activities adhered to established professional learning policy and procedures.

Teachers at SSIP schools reported they were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning activities provided by GDOE.

Long-Term Outcome: SiMR

Activities:

Discussion & research on the procedures & standards for quality, evidence-based PL

Leveraging SPDG to engage stakeholders in building a more responsive PL system to improve reading

Early Childhood and Elementary PL mapping conducted through the SPDG project

CIS#4: EBPs

Short-Term Outcome: Teachers at the SSIP schools have increased knowledge in the implementation of EBPs and supplemental interventions in reading.

Intermediate Outcomes:

Teachers at the SSIP schools implemented EBPs in reading with fidelity.

Teachers in the SSIP schools implemented EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading for struggling readers.

Long-Term Outcomes: SiMR

Activities:

PL sessions on EBPs for reading (Science of Reading) & Explicit Instruction (EI)

PL & coaching sessions on the Reading Mastery program for RRTs

CIS #5: TA Support & Coaching

Short-Term Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools receiving TA support and coaching reported increased knowledge and skills in reading instruction.

Intermediate Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs and supplemental interventions with fidelity.

Long-Term Outcome: SiMR

Activities:

PL sessions provided by the district and the Progress Center for SpEd coaches on IEP components & coaching practices

PL session for ICs and SpEd coaches on EI

PL provided by the district to build the capacity of Instructional Coaches (ICs) to include training from REL on improving teacher performance through instructional coaching, the Learning Forward Coaching Academy, the Leading Transformation Institute, and training on the district's universal screener IC coaching activities for SSIP schools: Creating SMART goals and PDSAs, aimswebPlus data analysis, coaching for aimswebPlus school managers, classroom observations with feedback, and supporting new teachers

CIS #6: Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP)

Short-term Outcome: IEP teams increased their knowledge and skills in the development of IEP components for students with IEPs.

Intermediate Outcome: IEP Teams developed, reviewed, and revised IEPs to ensure they are procedurally and substantively sound.

Long-Term Outcome: SiMR

Activities:

PL sessions for SpEd coaches on IEP development from the Progress Center

Coaching on IEP development provided to IEP teams by SpEd coaches

Coaching on specific IEP stipulations by SpEd coaches

Administrator training on IEP development by SpEd coaches and leadership team

CIS #7: Monitoring & Accountability

Short-term Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools have increased knowledge in EBPs for supplemental interventions and SDI in reading.

Intermediate Outcome: Teachers at SSIP schools implemented EBPs for supplemental interventions and SDI in reading with fidelity.

Long-Term Outcome: SiMR

Activities:

Fidelity observations for the implementation of Reading Mastery in the Resource Room

Lesson Progress Chart (LPC) analysis to monitor lesson progress for students with IEPs

Classroom observations on the implementation of PDSAs & EI

Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

CIS#1: Improvement Science

Outcomes achieved:

- Increased knowledge in improvement science.

- Increased knowledge in data-based decision making.

The outcomes for CIS#1 support governance as it ensures that leadership at the school & local levels advocate for appropriate resources & effectively plan, communicate, & collaborate to drive system improvement. It is also related to data & accountability/monitoring & quality standards as data is used to inform decisions & to support the implementation of quality programs. CIS#1 supports system change & is necessary for the achievement of the SiMR, sustainability of systems improvements efforts & scale-up by ensuring that administrators & teachers are equipped with the knowledge & skills to guide the implementation of EBPs & data-based decision making. Data collected to assess the outcome for this CIS are classroom observations, teachers surveys, & document reviews.

CIS#2: Family & Community Partners

Outcomes achieved:

- Implementation of family engagement strategies for improving reading.

- Families are knowledgeable about strategies for supporting reading at home & in the community.

The outcomes for CIS#2 are related to governance, professional development, & technical assistance. The focus of CIS#2 is on building administrative structures that maximize family engagement. CIS#2 involves providing opportunities for families to engage in learning opportunities centered on what



they can do at home & in the community to support their child/ren's reading progress which supports achievement of the SiMR. CIS#2 was delivered through school-based activities that were led by teachers and school principals. Also, SSIP classroom teachers work directly with families to engage them in activities to support families at home. Parent interviews were conducted to gather information from families with a child/ren with an IEP on how schools were helping families to support their child/ren in reading.

#### CIS#3: PL

Outcome achieved: Satisfaction with the quantity & intensity of the PL provided by GDOE.

The outcome for CIS#3 is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, and quality standards. Key to building the capacity of teachers is using data to determine critical areas for PL and to inform practices. The intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities include the number of school-level, job-embedded sessions that were conducted. Scale-up schools received PL centered on implementation of Improvement Science and EBPs. Target schools received PL focused on maintenance of Improvement Science and EBPs strategies. Target school resource room teachers also received PL related to the Reading Mastery program which is used as an intervention to assist in the delivery of SDI for students with IEPs.

Another outcome that is still in progress is the development of PL standards and procedures to ensure that the PL is of high quality. This outcome is aligned with GDOE's SPDG which is focused on creating a more responsive and relevant PL system that engages all stakeholders, including families. By leveraging the resources from the SPDG, the goal is to create a PL system that is sustained, intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, & classroom focused. In doing so, GDOE recognizes the benefits of calibrating initiatives & supports to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities. These indicators support system change & are necessary for achievement towards the SiMR because it is centered on developing the skill-set of front-line implementers in the use of EBPs through high-quality PL. End of PL teacher surveys were conducted to determine the perception of knowledge gained after sessions & to communicate achievement of the outcome.

#### CIS#4: EBPs

Outcomes achieved:

- Increased knowledge in the implementation of EBPs & interventions in reading.
- Implementation of EBPs for supplemental interventions in reading for struggling readers.

These outcomes are related to professional development/technical assistance, data, accountability/monitoring, & quality standards. The use of EBPs in reading increases the likelihood of positive student outcomes & increases responsiveness to learner needs. Therefore, this CIS supports system change & is necessary for achievement towards the SiMR.

The outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities include the number of PL & coaching sessions provided to RRTs in Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading) and the number of school-based sessions for K-3 Teachers in EBPs. The outcome was assessed through classroom observations & teacher surveys.

#### CIS#5: TA Support & Coaching

Outcomes achieved:

- Teachers receiving TA support and coaching reported increased knowledge & skills in reading instruction.
- Implementation of EBPs & interventions with fidelity.

The goal of CIS#5 is that teachers are knowledgeable and capable of delivering EBPs & interventions in reading. Therefore, the outcome is related to professional development/technical assistance, data, & quality standards.

Coaching supports fidelity of implementation through a focus on adherence of instructional procedures, duration, and quality of delivery. This process supports system change, impacts the achievement of the SiMR, & supports scale-up. However, for coaches to competently provide coaching, GDOE must support coaches by building their capacity through PL.

For this reporting period, coaching was provided in the implementation of Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading) for students with IEPs in the Resource Room to address their Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) on a monthly basis. General education teachers also received monthly school-based PL on EBPs. CIS#5 is implemented in tandem with CIS#4 (EBPs) & CIS#6 in which TA support & coaching is provided to ensure implementation of EBPs and the development of substantive IEPs. The outcome was assessed through classroom fidelity observations & teacher surveys.

#### CIS#6: Development, Implementation, & Monitoring of IEPs

Outcome in Progress: IEP teams increase knowledge & skills in the development of IEP components for students with IEPs. The outcome for CIS#6 is related to professional development/technical assistance & quality standards.

The focus of CIS#6 for this reporting period has been building the capacity of SpEd coaches through TA from the Progress Center in the development of the IEP components. SpEd coaches are at the frontlines in the delivery of TA for teachers & IEP teams. Therefore, the district has invested resources in building their capacity to support teachers & IEP teams. Outputs for this strategy are centered on the number of IEP coaching sessions provided to SSIP schools. Coaching sessions were provided to teachers based on IEP stipulations centered on autism. Coaching was focused on autism awareness, visuals strategies, reinforcement, & modeling. The outcome was assessed through teacher surveys.

#### CIS#7: Monitoring & Accountability

Outcomes achieved:

- Increased knowledge in EBPs for supplemental interventions & SDI in reading.
- Implementation of EBPs & supplemental interventions with fidelity.

This outcome is related to governance & quality standards. The focus of CIS#7 is the development of a systematic monitoring system to ensure implementation to fidelity of EBPs & interventions. This is driven by the need to guarantee that all students receive a high-quality education. CIS#7 is tethered to all other CIS as it ensures that all practices are ingrained in the system. This involves classroom observations, core team meetings, & data reviews. As a result, CIS#7 supports achievement towards the SiMR, sustainability of system improvement efforts, and scale-up. The outcome was assessed through the collection of fidelity data through observations & document reviews.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

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

CIS #1: Improvement Science

Next Steps:

Continued coaching and professional learning on the implementation of PDSAs

Anticipated Outcomes:

Increased implementation of PDSAs in scale-up and target schools

Increased fidelity in the implementation of the universal screener

Increased knowledge for K-3 teachers in data literacy and data-based decision-making  
Implementation of at least 3 PDSA cycles a year

#### CIS #2: Families and Community as Partners

##### Next Steps:

Continued leveraging of the work done through the GDOE SPDG to capitalize on the Leading by Convening framework and activities as a mechanism to engage SSIP families

##### Anticipated Outcomes:

Increased family engagement activities at SSIP schools

Increased knowledge of families in strategies for supporting reading at home

#### CIS #3: Professional Learning

##### Next Steps:

Continued leveraging of the work of the GDOE SPDG in developing GDOE's professional learning policy to encompass the ESEA definition of professional development, the Learning Forward Professional Development Standards, and the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders elements of high-quality practice-based opportunities.

##### Anticipated Outcomes:

Increased professional learning activities that encompasses policy and procedures that constitute quality professional learning

Increased percentage of teachers who were satisfied with the quantity and intensity of the professional learning provided

#### CIS #4 Evidence-Based Instructional Practices

##### Next Steps:

Continued professional learning and coaching on evidence-based instructional practices.

Continued implementation and monitoring of Lesson Progress Charts to track lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading for students with IEPs.

##### Anticipated Outcomes:

Implementation to fidelity of EBPs for reading instruction and interventions

Improved reading proficiency from one screening to the next for general and special education students.

#### CIS #5: TA Support & Coaching

##### Next Steps:

Continued professional learning for Instructional and SpEd coaches to build their coaching capacity

Continued coaching for general and special education teachers in evidence-based instructional practices

##### Anticipated Outcomes:

Increased knowledge and skills of teachers in EBPs for reading instruction and interventions

Improved reading proficiency from one screening to the next for general and special education students.

#### CIS #6: Development, Implementation, and Monitoring of Individualized Education Program (IEP)

##### Next Steps:

Continued professional learning and coaching on IEP development

##### Anticipated Outcomes:

Increased alignment between IEP components

Increased use of appropriate accommodations

#### CIS #7: Monitoring & Accountability

##### Next Steps:

Continued monitoring of the delivery of SDI and interventions for reading

Continued monitoring of lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading to ensure that students with IEPs are achieving appropriate lesson progress.

##### Anticipated Outcome:

Increased fidelity in the implementation of SDI and interventions for reading

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

The evidence-based practices implemented during this reporting period include the following:

- (1) Universal screening
- (2) Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)
- (3) Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Program)
- (4) Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading)
- (5) Coaching
- (6) Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

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

##### Universal Screening

Aligned with CIS #1, 7

Universal screening is a critical first step in identifying students who are at-risk for reading difficulties. Once identified, at-risk students can be provided with the appropriate scope of reading supports and interventions in addition to core instruction. Universal screening is essential in ensuring that reading problems are addressed timely before the achievement gap widens.

##### Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act)

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Improvement science is the basis for continuous improvement. It is centered on the premise that sustainable change is an ongoing process based on data collection, adaptation, and learning. Continuous improvement is focused on a specific problem and in testing practices and adapting them based on ongoing data collection. Three main questions guide the continuous improvement cycle (Shakman, K., Wagon, D., Rodriguez, S., Boyce, J., & Shaver, D., 2020):

- What problem are we trying to solve?

- What change might we introduce and why?
- How will we know that a change is actually an improvement?

#### Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Explicit instruction is a systematic, direct, purposeful way of teaching. Rosenshine (1987) defines explicit instruction as “a systematic method of teaching with emphasis on proceeding in small steps, checking for understanding, and achieving active and successful participation by all students”. The components of explicit instruction include having a clear objective, modeling, guided practice, independent practice, and supporting practices. GDOE utilizes the Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading program in the resource room as a mechanism for the delivery of explicit and systematic instruction for students with IEPs in the resource room.

#### Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)

Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

The Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read (April 2020) summarized research in the area of reading instruction. The National Reading Panel analysis was clear in its assertion that effective reading instruction must be systematic and explicit and must include the following components: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

#### Coaching

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6

Based on research by Joyce and Showers (2002), in order for the new skills learned in professional development to be transferred into the classroom, coaching is needed to help teachers successfully implement new knowledge and skills. Through on-going support from coaching, teachers are more likely to implement EBPs with greater fidelity. Coaching supports fidelity of implementation through a focus on adherence of instruction procedures, duration, and quality of delivery.

#### Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

The PLC framework is centered on the tenets of improvement science. It is during PLC meetings where the continuous improvement process unfolds. Three overarching principles undergird the PLC framework: ensure that students learn, a culture of collaboration, and a focus on results. In embracing the PLC framework, there is a shift from teaching to learning (Dufour, 2004). There are four focus questions that are threaded through a PLC meeting:

- What do we want students to learn?
- How do we know they've learned it?
- What do we do if they haven't learned it?
- What do we do if they've learned it?

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

#### Universal Screening

Aligned with CIS #1, 7

- Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning on administering the universal screener
- Professional learning on data analysis using aimswebPlus reading data
- Fidelity of administration observations were conducted to ensure the screener was being administered with fidelity

#### Impact on the SiMR

- At-risk students were identified in a timely manner (Change in program practice)
- Data from the screener is used to drive classwide and individual interventions (Change in teacher practices)
- Data from the screener is used for PDSAs (Change in teacher practices)

#### Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act-PDSAs)

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

- Activities and strategies that supported its use:
- Professional learning sessions on improvement science, Science of Reading, data analysis, Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Fidelity observations on the administration of the universal screener
- PDSA classroom observations

#### Impact on the SiMR

- Teachers and students use data to develop a goal and strategies to improve deficits in reading. (Change in teacher and student behavior)
- Students take ownership of their data and their learning. (Change in student behavior)
- Facilitates an on-going process of data collection, use of evidence-based practices, and adaptation based on data. (Change in teacher and program practices)
- Provides the basis for the delivery of EBPs and interventions (Change in teacher and program practices)

#### Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation)

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Activities and strategies that supported its use

- Professional learning for Resource Room Teachers (RRTs) in the use of explicit instruction in the delivery of the Direct Instruction (DI) Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs
- Coaching for RRTs on the use of explicit instruction with the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs

#### Impact on the SiMR

- Increased proficiency in the delivery of the Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading Programs. (Change in teacher practices)
- Reading tasks are broken down into smaller steps to reduce the cognitive load for struggling readers. (Change in teacher practices)
- Practice and corrective feedback are provided in a timely manner to increase the attainment and mastery of reading skills. (Change in teacher practices)

#### Science of Reading (5 Components of Reading Instruction)

Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Activities and strategies that supported its use:

- Professional learning in the use of knowledge of the 5 Components of Reading instruction in the development of PDSAs
- Professional learning in using data from aimswebPlus to determine what area of reading instruction needs to be targeted in instruction and in the development of PDSAs.
- Professional learning of various EBPs that fall under the 5 Components of Reading instruction (e.g. Elkonin boxes, repeated reading, word building, etc.)

#### Impact on the SiMR

- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)
- Students are provided with reading instruction that is balanced and meets their needs. (Change in teacher practices)

#### Coaching

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6

Activities and strategies that supported its use:

- Professional learning sessions from the Progress Center for SpEd coaches on IEP components
- Continued professional learning provided by the district to build the capacity of Instructional Coaches (ICs) to include training from REL on improving teacher performance through instructional coaching, Coach's Training Academy with Learning Forward, training to ICs on the district's universal screener, and training on Leading Transformation.
- IC coaching activities for SSIP schools: Creating SMART goals and PDSAs, aimswebPlus data analysis, coaching for aimswebPlus school managers, classroom observations with feedback, and supporting new SSIP teachers
- SpEd coaches activities for SSIP schools: Coaching on the development of PLAAFP and goals

#### Impact on the SiMR

- Increased proficiency in the delivery of effective reading instruction. (Change in teacher practices)
- The development of an effective PLAAFP statement and goals drives the determination of the appropriate SDI to meet the unique needs of the student. (Change in teacher practices)

#### Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6

Activities and strategies that supported its use:

- PLCs provide the mechanism by which aimswebPlus data was analyzed to inform practices and to develop PDSAs

#### Impact on the SiMR

- Increased and deliberate focus on using data to drive instruction and interventions. (Change in teacher practices)
- Increased and deliberate focus on identifying EBPs to address gaps in instruction and interventions. (Change in teacher practices)

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

Criteria for Scoring Implementation:

Level 1 (0%-25%) Little or no implementation

Level 2 (26%-50%) Some implementation

Level 3 (51%-75%) Moderate implementation

Level 4 (76%-100%) Strong implementation

#### Universal Screener Fidelity Data (CIS #1, 7)

##### Target Schools

K-3 teachers within the four Target and four ScaleUp schools were systematically observed to examine their instructional and assessment practices in the areas of Oral Reading Frequency (ORF) and Early Literacy. The practices associated with ORF and Early Literacy were observed during the Fall 2023 administration of the screener. School principals used a standardized protocol and fidelity checklist to determine the level of fidelity in the administration of the aimswebPlus Early Literacy and Reading measures.

When analyzing the instructional and assessment practices in both the areas of Oral Reading Frequency (ORF) and Early Literacy in the Target Schools, it was found that 99.43% (Level 4) of tasks were implemented with fidelity. Further examination provides evidence that ORF tasks were implemented at a 98.83% (Level 4) fidelity level while Early Literacy practices were implemented at 100% (Level 4) fidelity rate. Of note, only three of the four SSIP schools provided data for the Early Literacy screening practices, and the percentage reported reflects only that data.

For the ScaleUp Schools, the fidelity percentage was also high: 93.23% (Level 4). Further examination of the data from the ScaleUp Schools demonstrates that both the ORF and Early Literacy practices were carried out with similar levels of fidelity (93.76% and 92.99% respectively-Level 4).

In addition to the number of tasks implemented with fidelity, the observation data were analyzed to determine how many teachers were implementing all observed tasks with fidelity. Across the four Target schools, a total of 53 teachers were observed implementing at least one fidelity checklist item. Of those, 91.38% (Level 4) were implementing practices across the ORF and Early Literacy screening with 100% fidelity. For the Scale-Up schools, 76 teachers were observed. Of those, 60% (Level 3) of the teachers were implementing practices across the ORF and Early Literacy screening with 100% fidelity.

#### Professional Learning (PL) Feedback (CIS # 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)

The following indicates a snapshot of the results of an online End-of-Year (EOY) teacher survey centered on the level of skill on PL content.

Percentages indicate "moderate" to "high" skill in the specific areas. The survey was disseminated at the end of SY22-23 to the 4 target schools (T) and the 4 scale-up schools (S). Responses represent data from 5 out of 8 schools and from K-3 teachers.. Three schools had no responses. A total of 30 participants, 11 from the target schools and 19 from the scale-up school, completed the survey. Indicators below focus on the data analysis & interpretation content:

Generating data reports from screener

T: 100% (11/11)-Level 4

S: 89% (17/19)-Level 4

Analyzing Benchmark Comparison Data

T: 100% (11/11)-Level 4

S: 89% (17/19)-Level 4  
Determining Level of Intervention:  
T: 91% (10/11)-Level 4  
S: 74% (14/19)-Level 3

The following indicates the results of an end of training evaluation focused on PDSA, Science of Reading, and EI. The training took place in August 2023. Teachers rated their level of knowledge before and after the training. A total of 129 teachers from both target and scale-up schools completed the evaluation. The following percentages demonstrate “moderate” to “high” knowledge levels after the PL as well as satisfaction of the training:

PDSA-95% 122/129-Level 4  
Science of Reading-99%-127/129-Level 4  
Explicit Instruction-95%-122/129-Level 4  
Overall satisfaction with PL-97% 125/129-Level 4

Universal Screening Data (CIS #1,7)  
aimswebPlus data is described under the prompt “Has the state collected additional data?”

Supplemental Interventions: Direct Instruction (DI): Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading Classroom Fidelity Data (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)  
Resource Room teachers from the 4 SSIP target schools were systematically observed in order to examine their instructional practices in the delivery of Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading. Across the four schools, a total of 6 teachers were observed implementing reading instruction. The instructional practices were observed in November 2023. A standardized protocol and fidelity checklist to determine the level of fidelity in the delivery of the reading program was used.. When analyzing the instructional practices, it was found that 82% (Level 4) of tasks were implemented with fidelity. In addition to the number of tasks implemented with fidelity, the observation data were analyzed to determine how many teachers were implementing all observed tasks with fidelity. Of the 6 teachers observed, 50% (3/6) (Level 2) were implementing instructional practices with 100% fidelity.

PDSA Classroom Observations (CIS #1, 3, 4, 6, 7)  
SSIP principals from the 4 target schools conducted classroom observations & document reviews to determine the level of implementation of PDSA cycles in grades K-3 to support Improvement Science. The observations showed 98% (56/57) of K-3 teachers in the 4 target schools have implemented a PDSA cycle based on their universal screening data. This demonstrates a 1% increase from FFY2021. This percentage is indicative of Level 4 or strong implementation.

Explicit Instruction (EI) Observations (CIS#1,3,4,5,6,7)  
K-3 teachers in the 4 target schools (T) & the 4 scale-up schools (S) were systematically observed by principals, ICs, and TA providers during the 1st quarter of SY 23-24 during reading instruction. 13 elements of EI were observed using a standard observation protocol. Elements included: critical content, breaking down material into smaller steps, organized & focused lesson, statement of learning goal, review, I do, We do, You do, frequent responses, monitoring student performance, providing immediate feedback, brisk pace, & judicious practice. Limitations of the data include the need for inter-rater reliability discussions to ensure ratings were consistent across evaluators. In the target schools, a total of 68 teachers were observed, 40 from the target schools and 28 from the scale-up schools. The following indicates the % of teachers observed implementing the EI element during instruction:

Critical content  
T: 97% (39/40)-Level 4  
S: 86% (24/28)-Level 4  
Smaller Steps  
T: 68% (27/40)-Level 3  
S: 61% (17/28)-Level 3  
Organized & Focused  
T: 58% (23/40)-Level 3  
S: 36% (10/28)-Level 2  
Learning Goal  
T: 83% (33/40)-Level 4  
S: 83% (24/28)-Level 4  
Review  
T: 58% (23/40)-Level 3  
S: 86% (24/28)-Level 4  
I Do  
T: 65% (26/40)-Level 3  
S: 43% (12/28)-Level 2  
We Do  
T: 60% (24/40)-Level 3  
S: 82% (23/28)-Level 4  
You Do  
T: 48% (19/40)-Level 2  
S: 29% (8/28)-Level 2  
Frequent responses  
T: 55% (22/40)-Level 3  
S: 89% (25/28)-Level 4  
Monitors student performance  
T: 68% (27/40)-Level 3  
S: 86% (24/28)-Level 4  
Feedback  
T: 73% (29/40)-Level 3  
S: 89% (25/28)-Level 4  
Brisk Pace  
T: 63% (25/40)-Level 3  
S: 82% (23/28)-Level 4  
Practice  
T: 68% (27/40)-Level 3  
S: 50% (14/28)-Level 2

In summary, target schools demonstrated moderate to strong implementation, in 92% or 12 out of 13 EI elements. The scale-up schools demonstrated a Level 3 or Level 4 in 69% or 9 out of 13 indicators.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

**Core Team Meeting Notes (CIS#7)**

Core team meeting notes were used to determine how monitoring and accountability were conducted.

Supplemental Interventions: Direct Instruction (DI): Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading Classroom Lesson Progress Data (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)  
Lesson Progress Charts (LPCs) are used to analyze the overall status of implementation, to continuously monitor mastery and lesson progress, to determine areas that require change, and to identify solutions. An analysis of LPCs from the 6 Resource Room teachers at the 4 SSIP target schools was conducted to determine if teachers were achieving adequate lesson gains. Percentage of lesson completion was determined by dividing the # of lessons completed by the # of instructional days in the week. It was found that teachers had an overall lesson completion rate of 55% (Level 3) or 2.6-3.8 lessons a week.

**Continuous Improvement Science Survey (CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)**

The following indicates the results of an online Continuous Improvement Survey (CI) that was disseminated to K-3 teachers at the target and scale-up schools at the beginning of SY23-23. Teachers were asked to rate their proficiency using a scale of Level 1-Level 3 in each of the CI components. Level 3 is the highest indicator of proficiency in the implementation of each component. A total of 97 teachers responded to the survey—44 from the target schools (T) and 53 from scale-up schools (S). The following percentages demonstrate teachers who rated themselves at a Level 3 on each of the components of C1:

**Learning Objectives**

T: 36% (16/44)-Level 2

S: 36% (19/53)-Level 2

**Classroom Goals**

T: 77% (34/44)-Level 4

S: 66% (35/53)-Level 4

**Chart & Analyze Data**

T: 41% (18/44)-Level 2

S: 28% (15/53)-Level 2

**Mission Statement**

T: 36% (16/44)-Level 2

S: 57% (30/53)-Level 3

**Plan**

T: 20% (9/44)-Level 1

S: 21% (11/53)-Level 1

**Do**

T: 18% (8/44)-Level 1

S: 17% (9/53)-Level 1

**Study**

T: 14% (6/44)-Level 1

S: 19% (10/53)-Level 1

**Act**

T: 5% (2/44)-Level 1

S: 6% (3/53)-Level 1

In summary, across all the 8 components, both target and scale-up schools are at a Level 2 for implementation. This indicates some implementation but a need for more coaching and support in the CI process especially in the area of the PDSA.

**Science of Reading Survey: (CIS # 3, 4, 5, 7)**

A teacher self-assessment survey for K-3 target school teachers was conducted in December 2023 to assess the perception of teachers on the implementation of the Science of Reading. The tool used was the How Do I Feel Survey. The survey measured teachers' perceptions on 6 statements related to reading instruction. Teachers rated themselves based on the following Likert scale:

1. Not so clear about this
2. I know a little bit
3. I know about this well
4. I know this well enough to implement in my classroom
5. I have incorporated this in my classroom

52 K-3 teachers completed the survey from the 4 target schools. The implementation items on the survey (#4 and #5) were extrapolated to determine the level of implementation. The data yielded the following results:

1. Reading Big Ideas 58%% (30/52) -Level 3
2. Phonemic Awareness 63% (33/52)-Level 3
3. Phonics 62% (32/52) Level 3
4. Fluency 63% (33/52) Level 3
5. Vocabulary 63%(33/52) Level 3
6. Comprehension 62% (32/52) Level 3

In summary, the data on how teachers felt about implementing the 5 Components of Reading Instruction in their classrooms yielded an overall Level 3 or Moderate Implementation.

**Parent Interviews (CIS# 2, 7)**

Information was gathered, via interviews with family members, on how schools could help families to support their children in improving their reading skills. To collect these data, telephone interviews were conducted with parents of children who attended the four SSIP target schools. Interviewers asked parents six (6) standard questions. Forty-eight (48) families of students with disabilities across the four SSIP target schools were identified, and fifty-five

(55) parents were contacted via phone. Of those, 28 (58%) completed the interview. The response rate for this year's interviews is higher than last year's response rate of 33%. The following provides a summary of the questions asked in the phone interviews.

When asked how the school helped parents to help their child(ren) improve their reading, parents reported that schools provided reading materials in appropriate formats as well as providing additional learning tools such as worksheets, and other materials specific to the reading curriculum their child was using. A few noted the benefit of being able to check out books, and the recommendations for iPad applications to support reading. One parent noted that incentives for reading provided by the teacher was supporting her child to read. Parents also described the strategies that teachers and schools use to communicate with parents about their child(ren)'s reading performance. Some examples included using notebooks and journals, emailing information to parents, and using web-based applications such as WhatsApp. Many noted the use of a communication log that noted the skills the child(ren) were working on in school. Other parents indicated that primary communication with the school and teachers was achieved through student conferences, face to face meetings, or the telephone. In many cases, the communication was done through multiple venues and was consistent overall.

When asked about what additional supports they need from the school, many parents indicated they would like "more" or "continued" support like what they are currently receiving. Some suggestions include providing children's books and/or "practice stories" to parents so they can work with their child(ren) at home. Overall, most of the parents, 79% (Level 4), noted that they were able to support their child(ren) at home.

#### Coaching Survey (CIS#3,5,6,7)

Two teacher surveys were conducted to gain feedback on the coaching provided to teachers. The first survey was given to SSIP resource room teachers who received coaching and training on the implementation of Direct Instruction for reading. 8 teachers responded to the survey. Based on the feedback provided, 63%(5/8)(Level 3) of teachers indicated increased knowledge and skill in Organization (using DI materials, forms, preparation of instruction; 75% (6/8)(Level 3) reported increased knowledge and skill in Procedures (following steps in script, use of appropriated signals, following correction procedures, eliciting frequent responses, ensuring mastery).

The second survey was conducted by Special Education coaches after IEP stipulation training. The training was inclusive of SSIP schools. 88% (76/88) Level 4 of teachers were satisfied with the training provided by the Special Education coaches.

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

##### Universal Screening Aligned with CIS #1, 7

###### Next Steps:

- Continued PL on data literacy using the universal screener
- Continued PL on progress monitoring
- Continued observations of the administration of the universal screener to ensure that data is being collected with fidelity.

###### Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:

- Increased knowledge and skills in data-based decision making
- Increased proficiency in administering the universal screener with fidelity
- Increased knowledge and skills in implementing progress monitoring
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener

##### Improvement Science (Plan, Do, Study, Act) Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

###### Next Steps:

- Continued PL & coaching on using data from the universal screener to develop PDSAs
- Continued PL on the selection of EBPs for PDSAs
- Continued PL & coaching on the development of classroom PDSAs

###### Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:

- Increased knowledge and skill in developing classroom PDSAs
- Increased knowledge and skill in selecting EBPs for PDSAs
- Increased implementation of EBPs and interventions for reading
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the district assessment.

##### Explicit Instruction (Reading Mastery Implementation) Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

###### Next Steps:

- Continued PL & coaching for RRTs on DI Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Continued PL & coaching on explicit instruction components and how it can be incorporated with the Science of Reading and the school's core curriculum.
- Classroom observations and feedback on the delivery of explicit instruction for RRTs
- Continued implementation of LPCs to track lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading for students with IEPs.
- Continued monitoring of lesson completion in Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading to ensure that students with IEPs are achieving appropriate lesson progress.

###### Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:

- Increased knowledge and skill in the delivery of explicit instruction through the use of the Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading programs
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

##### Science of Reading (SOR) - 5 Components of Reading Instruction Aligned with CIS #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

###### Next Steps:

- Continued PL & coaching on developing PDSAs centered on the components of reading
- Continued PL & coaching on selecting specific EBPs for each of the 5 components of reading instruction.
- PL & coaching on how the SOR is incorporated in the school's core curriculum.

Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:

- Increased knowledge and skill in the selection of EBPs for each of the 5 components of reading
- Increased knowledge and skill in developing PDSAs centered on the 5 components of reading instruction
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

Coaching

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6

Next Steps:

- Development of a systematic coaching system.
- Continued PL to build the capacity of SpEd and Instructional coaches.

Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:

- Teachers implement EBPs & interventions learned through PL and coaching with fidelity
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.
- Through coaching, RRTs are knowledgeable and skilled in the development of procedurally and substantively sound IEPs.

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

Aligned with CIS #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

Next Steps:

- Continued use of the PLC as a mechanism for the implementation of data-based decision making, PDSAs, and job-embedded PL & coaching.

Anticipated outcomes for next reporting period:

- Increased knowledge of teachers in how to use the data from the universal screener to develop a classroom PDSA and to make data-based decisions.
- Increased percent of students at SSIP schools proficient in reading as measured by the universal screener.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The following evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modification to the SSIP:

Areas Demonstrating Strong to Moderate Implementation

(1) PDSA Classroom Observations—Level 4 (Strong Implementation)

(2) Universal Screening Benchmark—over 50% increase in the percentage of students at proficiency levels

Increase in the percentage of students average and above in the following measures:

K: 79% increase in LNF

K: 200% increase in IS for students with IEPs

Increase in the percentage of students benchmark and above in the following measures:

K: 78% increase in IS

K: 262% increase in IS for students with IEPs

3rd: 88% increase in ORF

(3) Improvement Science Teacher Survey- Level 4 (Strong Implementation)

(4) Direct Instruction (Reading Mastery/Corrective Reading) Observations & Coaching- Level 4 (Strong Implementation)

(5) Universal Screener Fidelity Observation-Level 4 (Strong Implementation)

(6) Professional Learning Surveys—Level 4 (Strong Implementation)

(7) Parent Interviews-Level 4 (Strong Implementation)

(8) Coaching Survey (Resource Room teachers)-Level 4 (Strong Implementation)

(9) Teacher Self- Assessment -Science of Reading (SOR)-Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)

(10) Direct Instruction Lesson Progress Analysis-Level 3 (Moderate Implementation)

(11) Explicit Instruction: 92% (12/13) of EI elements were observed being implemented at Level 4 or Level 3 in target schools; 69% (9/13) of EI elements were observed being implemented at Level 4 or Level 3 in scale-up schools.

Areas Demonstrating Some Implementation & Little or No Implementation:

(1) Universal Screener Benchmark Data (3rd grade students with IEPs)—Level 1 (Little or No Implementation)

(2) Continuous Improvement Survey-Level 2 (Some Implementation)

In summary, the data demonstrates strong implementation in teacher practices. However, the change in teacher practice has not shown the intended impact on student performance, especially for students with IEPs. Though, it should be noted that data on the universal screener has shown increases in the percentage of students at proficiency levels, with 3rd graders, the target grade-level for the SiMR, showing an 88% increase in ORF for all students. Moving forward, a targeted focus on how these practices are being delivered at the classroom level is critical as a next step for the next reporting period. Continued coaching on the delivery of EBPs to fidelity and progress monitoring need to continue. Continuing to leverage and calibrate supports from Instructional Coaches, SpEd coaches, the SPDG grant, and national TA centers such as the Progress Center is essential.

## Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

### Description of Stakeholder Input

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



include the following:

- Flyers and emails were sent out to parents and all interested stakeholders announcing focus group forum sessions focused on Indicator 8.
- Several in-person and virtual meetings were held with smaller focus groups to engage participants in discussions surrounding Indicator "clusters," such as Secondary Clusters (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14); Early Childhood Preschool Clusters and Parent Involvement (Indicators 6, 7, and 12; and Indicator 8); School Age Clusters (Indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11); and the SSIP (Indicator 17).
- At least three stakeholder sessions were held to review the performance data for all the Indicators for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR. One session was held virtually, while the other sessions were conducted in-person.
- Electronic and hard copies of the SPP/APR and PPT presentation were provided to all participants for each small focus group sessions and larger stakeholder sessions.
- Survey questions were posed to parents during the parent forum sessions conducted virtually and in-person for Indicator 8.
- Surveys were sent out to youth with IEPs who exited the system in SY2021-2022, along with follow-up phone calls and contacts through social media such as FaceBook and InstaGram for Indicator 14.
- Parent interviews were conducted with parents of children with disabilities enrolled in the four SSIP target schools.
- Administrators, Teacher Leaders and parents of children enrolled in the SSIP schools held monthly family engagement activities focused on literacy. Additionally, several planning meetings and core team meetings are held every month throughout the school year to review progress data on the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies and to determine next steps for the SSIP.

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

August 5, 2023: During the Division's Orientation session held at the beginning of the school year, all compliance Indicators were reviewed with personnel to review performance data and to discuss ways in which Guam could meet the 60-Day Timeline, in particular. The process in which data is collected for Indicator 11 was reviewed with Division personnel. The purpose of this presentation was two-fold: (1) present performance data for the compliance Indicators; and most importantly, (2) engage in a discussion with Division personnel to emphasize their roles in the performance data and how they could contribute to improving the data, which would lead to improving outcomes for the students with IEPs they serve.

August 18, 2023: Indicators 11 and 13 were reviewed with the secondary school Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) who are the case managers for students with IEPs in the GDOE middle and high schools. The purpose of the session was to review the processes in which data for these indicators are collected and reported to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), along with the roles these case managers would play in assisting with supporting the data collection efforts to improve outcomes for youth with IEPs enrolled in their schools.

October 13, 2023: A focus group session was held with the Division SPED Coaches assigned to the high schools to review the performance data for Indicators 13 and 14. This engagement sparked the conversation with the process the high schools will be submitting data for Indicator 13 and how the SPED Coaches will be verifying and validating the data submissions. For Indicator 14, SPED Coaches confirmed they connected with each case manager to get updated demographic information for the exiting students.

December 5 & 12, 2023 and January 11, 2024: Focus group sessions were held with parent and community partner members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD). Each session focused on specific "clusters" of the SPP/APR. Stakeholders were especially engaged in conversations surrounding the performance data for the secondary cluster (Indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14) and the reasons for the slippage in each of these Indicators. During the session focused on the early childhood clusters, GAPSD members were also discussing ways in which preschool children with disabilities, especially those 3-years of age, could be included in settings with their typically developing peers.

Indicator 8 focus group sessions (February, March, April, and May 2023): Several focus group sessions were held with representatives from the GDOE Division of Special Education, UOG CEDDERS, and parent members from GAPSD, the Autism Communities Together (ACT) parent group, and the Parent Training Information (PTI) Center to review and revise, where necessary, the parent survey to be distributed for Indicator 8. After the survey results were received, the focus group members reviewed the data and engaged in discussions surrounding the results of the survey and the recommendations made by parents to increase their involvement as a means for improving the educational outcomes their children with IEPs.

November 29, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was presented to personnel from the four public charter schools on Guam. The purpose of the session was to inform public charter school personnel about the process in which the data from their schools are included in the SPP/APR, along with how a student with a disability enters and exits the system once identified as a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.

December 21, 2023: The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was reviewed with all school administrators during the week-long "Boot Camp" training session held over the winter break. The session included a description of the entire SPP/APR, Guam's performance in each of the indicators, and the "story" behind the life span of a student with a disability upon entering and exiting the system. Administrators were engaged in the discussion surrounding the data for graduation, drop-outs, and discipline and had questions surrounding the performance data for these particular indicators.

January 5, 2024: During a "welcome back" session after the winter break, Division personnel regrouped to review organizational changes and their roles and responsibilities. Among the discussion items involved updates on the compliance Indicators for the SPP/APR and the alignment the SPP/APR has with GDOE's State Strategic Plan. Reasons for delay were discussed for Indicator 11 and explanations addressing the "slippage" with this compliance indicator were reviewed. Division stakeholders agreed to the statements explaining the slippage with Indicator 11 and the actions that will be taken and reported in this FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

January 18, 2024: A stakeholder session was held virtually with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities to review the FFY 2022 SPP/APR in its entirety. GAPSD members engaged in the discussion focused on the graduation and dropout performance data for youth with IEPs who exited during SY2021-2022 and the reasons for the slippage in both Indicators 1 & 2. Panel members were also looking at the number of children in the "home setting" for Indicator 6C. Strategies were discussed with how families could place their children in more natural settings with their typically developing peers instead of opting for home services.

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

For this reporting period, there were seven in-person key planning meetings held monthly with personnel from GDOE and the University of Guam CEDDERS to ensure the SSIP schools were implementing the activities outlined in the SSIP through the review of data from aimswebPlus and the observations and fidelity checks of the reading programs implemented in the classrooms. Each meeting was announced via email as participants were sent calendar invitations for the meetings.

Additionally, there were nine Core Planning Team meetings that are held every third Wednesday of the month. Attendees at these meetings comprised of the SSIP school principals, teacher leaders from each of the SSIP schools, GDOE Instructional Coaches, and parents of children with IEPs enrolled in the SSIP schools. During the Core Team meetings, agenda items included the following:

- results of the previous and current summative and secondary data (aimswebPlus) for the SSIP
- fidelity checks of aimswebPlus administration; fidelity of reading instruction; and SDI observations in the resource rooms
- results of the observations of the fidelity of reading instruction (Reading Mastery program) and the core Reading program
- continued training on PDSA, explicit instruction, and reading strategies
- progress and updates on the revisions of the Theory of Action, the Logic Model, and the Evaluation Plan

An added agenda item during the Core Team meetings includes the review of the Lesson Progress Charts (LPCs) submitted by the Resource Room Teachers at each of the SSIP Schools. The LPCs describe the progress of the lessons taught during the week and a summary of any mastery tests or checkouts. This is to determine how many lessons were taught during the week and whether or not the students were passing the checkouts. The LPCs also include the number of reading groups and students within each reading group. Notations on the LPC are made if there are any absences during the week (Teacher or Student) or if there were any deviations from the reading schedule due to school events such as field trips or assemblies. Core Team members found the data compiled from the LPCs very helpful as it is indicative of the progress/non progress made for students with IEPs. The LPCs also assist in the monitoring of progress towards IEP goals focused on language and literacy.

Interviews were also conducted with parents of children with disabilities attending the SSIP schools. Phone calls were made to engage parents in a discussion with how the schools involved them in their child's education, most especially in Reading instruction through the family engagement activities at the SSIP schools. The interviews also included a question focused on whether families increased their knowledge in the strategies they could implement and incorporate in their daily life to support reading in the home. Through the interviews, parents shared successes, as well as concerns, related to their child's progress in reading.

Furthermore, to promote family engagement within their campuses, SSIP schools also facilitated school-based family engagement activities throughout the school year to include Literacy Nights and family reading workshops.

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

NO

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

None at this time.

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

Not applicable.

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

There are no newly identified barriers at this time.

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

For this FFY 2022 APR reporting period, Guam did not administer the district-wide assessment in Reading and Math for all children. As such, data for students with IEPs who participated with and without accommodations in the district-wide assessment is not available. Guam is unable to report on progress or slippage towards the SiMR. As a result, performance data for the SSIP schools was not reported in Indicator 17. Scale-up data pertaining to fidelity of implementation in the universal screener, explicit instruction, and professional level was included in this reporting period to help determine baseline data.

Data for children with IEPs who participated in the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards is available as Guam administered the alternate assessment with alternate achievement standards during this FFY 2022 APR period. There were no children with disabilities in the 3rd grade in the SSIP schools whose IEPs determined participation in the district-wide assessment through an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

## **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **17 - OSEP Response**

Guam did not report any data for this indicator. Guam reported it did not administer its district-wide assessment during the reporting period. Therefore, data for students with IEPs who participated with and without accommodations in the district-wide assessment is not available. As a result, OSEP could not determine whether Guam met its targets.

## **17 - Required Actions**

Guam did not provide data for FFY 2022. Guam must provide the required data for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

#### **Name:**

Tom Babauta

#### **Title:**

Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

#### **Email:**

tcbabauta@gdoe.net

#### **Phone:**

(671)777-7732

#### **Submitted on:**

04/24/24 8:35:26 AM

## Determination Enclosures

### RDA Matrix

## Guam

### 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education

#### Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
75.00%	Needs Assistance

#### Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	4	4	100.00%
Compliance	12	7	58.33%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education, Part B."

#### 2024 Part B Results Matrix

##### Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 3-8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A

##### Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 3-8		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

**Exiting Data Elements**

<b>Exiting Data Elements</b>	<b>Performance (%)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years</b>	11	2
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years**</b>	89	2

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	72.26%	N/A	0
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	81.62%	NO	1
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	97.47%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			0
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	Yes, 5 or more years		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:  
[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024\\_Part-B\\_SPP-APR\\_Measurement\\_Table.pdf](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf)

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are  $\geq 5\%$  and  $< 10\%$  for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and  $\geq 90\%$  and  $< 95\%$  for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

**Data Rubric**  
**Guam**

FFY 2022 APR (1)

**Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data**

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	N/A	0
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	N/A	0
10	N/A	0
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

**APR Score Calculation**

<b>Subtotal</b>	18
<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	23

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

**618 Data (2)**

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	0	2
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

**618 Score Calculation**

Subtotal	20
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	24.76

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.



**Indicator Calculation**

A. APR Grand Total	23
B. 618 Grand Total	24.76
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	47.76
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	3
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
<b>Denominator</b>	49.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9747
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	97.47

**(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

## APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

**DATE:** February 2024 Submission

### SPP/APR Data

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

### Part B 618 Data

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check** – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

## Dispute Resolution

### IDEA Part B

Guam

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

#### Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

<b>(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.</b>	3
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	3
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	1
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	3
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

#### Section B: Mediation Requests

<b>(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.</b>	0
(2.1) Mediations held.	0
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	0

#### Section C: Due Process Complaints

<b>(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.</b>	6
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	6
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	6
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	6

#### Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

<b>(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.</b>	0
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	0
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

**State Comments:**

**Errors:**

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Guam

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES**

**Final Determination Letter**

June 21, 2024

Honorable Kenneth Swanson  
Superintendent  
Guam Department of Education  
501 Mariner Avenue  
Barrigada, GU 96913

Dear Superintendent Swanson:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Guam needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Guam's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Guam's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education-Part B" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations for outlying areas, freely associated States and the Bureau of Indian Education (the Entities) in 2024, as it did for determinations in 2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Guam).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP used results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Guam's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Guam-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Guam's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Guam is required to take. The actions that Guam is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Guam's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD link;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

[www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov)

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES**

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Guam's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Guam's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Guam's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

Guam's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP) | OSEP Ideas That Work, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Topic Areas, and requiring Guam to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Guam should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link:

<https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs 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. We strongly encourage Guam to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Guam must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. §300.606, Guam must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Guam must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on its agency website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing an Entity Profile that:

- (1) includes Guam's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

[www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov)

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

OSEP appreciates Guam's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Guam over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

*Valerie C. Williams*

---

Valerie C. Williams

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Guam Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

[www.ed.gov](http://www.ed.gov)

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*