

GU Part B

FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

This Executive Summary includes a description of Guam's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2017. 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 2017 APR.

In FFY 2013, Guam stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2017 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. As per OSEP's instructions, Indicators 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 2017 data to determine if Guam met its FFY 2017 target, an explanation of slippage if Guam did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2018 OSEP SPP/APR Determination Letter for Guam's FFY 2016 SPP/APR. Although Guam did not meet all its results and compliance targets for FFY 2017, stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

As required for Indicator 17, Guam's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), Guam will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year 3 no later than April 1, 2019.

RESPONSE TO OSEP DETERMINATION LETTER, JUNE 28, 2018 AND THE REQUIRED ACTIONS IN FFY 2017 APR:

Guam's determination was "needs assistance," which remained the same as in 2017. As per OSEP's Determination Letter, Guam is strongly encouraged to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which Guam received a score of zero. Guam must report with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, 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, therefore, provides the following information to meet the Secretary's reporting requirements stated in the OSEP June 28, 2019 Determination Letter:

Based on the 2018 Part B Results Driven Accountability Matrix for Guam, a score of zero was not received in the 2018 Part B Results Matrix.

In the 2018 Part B Compliance Matrix under "Longstanding Noncompliance," Guam received a score of zero (0) for its Department-Wide Special Conditions and Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance.

For the "Department-Wide Special Conditions," the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance and the actions taken as a result of the technical assistance are as follows:

- Technical assistance received for the longstanding noncompliance related to the Department-Wide Special Conditions:
 - GDOE continues to work with the Department's Risk Management Service (RMS) to address Guam DOE's Special Conditions. The GDOE Comprehensive Corrective Action Plan (CCAP) describes the required activities.
- Letters from the RMS and GDOE CCAP reports can be found on the GDOE website: <http://www.gdoe.net>
- Actions taken as a result of the RMS technical assistance:
 - Guam Part B provides quarterly reports to RMS demonstrating progress towards addressing the Special Conditions.

The "Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance" related to Indicators 11 and 13. The technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance and the actions taken as a result of the technical assistance are as follows:

- Technical assistance received for the longstanding noncompliance related to Indicators 11 and 13 uncorrected identified noncompliance:
 - With guidance from OSEP, Guam Part B continued to work with Guam CEDDERS for Indicators 11 and 13. In

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

addition, Guam Part B initiated a technical assistance request with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) for Indicator 13. The NTACT consultation included an on-site technical assistance visit in December 2018, and in collaboration with the Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center (WINTAC), a second on-site visit in April 2019.

- Actions taken as a result of the technical assistance:

- With guidance from OSEP, Guam Part B continued to work with the GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) in the verification of correction of noncompliance and support to the Division and schools to address the system issues related to Indicators 11 and 13 compliance requirements. For Indicator 13, GDOE CMO engaged in the implementation of the NTACT technical assistance activities to ensure that the training and guidance address the Indicator 13 noncompliance issues. Additional information related to Guam Part B's efforts to address the "Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance" can be found in Indicators 11 and 13 of this FFY 2017 APR.

Additionally, Guam Part B also avails 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), and the Partner Support Center (PSC) for the required IDEA/618 data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts.

Furthermore, Guam Part B continues to utilize the technical assistance and support from its regional technical assistance provider, University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS).

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

1

General Supervision System:

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

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

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

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

Attachments

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

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

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

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

As part of the GDOE State Strategic Plan, there is a conceptual framework for instructional leadership and school level leadership inclusive of school cadre teams who serve as resources in their respective schools, to include providing information on CCSS and other available resources. Additionally, using the standards of professional learning, each school has a collaborative learning team. These collaborative learning teams use the premise of Curriculum-Instruction-Assessment-Interventions which uses data to drive decisions to improve outcomes for all students. Moreover, the GDOE has implemented a Teacher and Principal evaluation system to allow for a systemic way for GDOE to identify areas of strengths and opportunities for improvement as a means to improve student performance on all state-level assessments.

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

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

Furthermore, Guam Part B received technical assistance and support for the development of Guam's FFY 2017 State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report through OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources such as the DaSY Center, IDC, ECTA, NTACT, NCSI, NCEO, and the EDFacts Partner Support Center for the required IDEA 618 data submissions to EDEN/EDFacts, and through the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (CEDDERS).

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

As part of Guam DOE's State Strategic Plan, one of the major components is the Professional Learning Communities

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(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. One such goal is that GDOE instructional personnel will meet high standards for qualifications and ongoing professional development and will be held accountable for all assigned responsibilities. There are a total of eight (8) professional development days in the GDOE School Calendar: all eight (8) days are Full-Day professional days and are designated specifically to the state-wide initiatives.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☒ apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

Guam Part B engaged stakeholders from the Division of Special Education, GDOE Administration, the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD), the Guam Education Board (GEB), and parents and representatives from other agencies and parent organizations in the review of data for each of the Indicators for the purposes of reviewing progress and discussing "slippage" for the submission of the FFY 2017 State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The development of Guam's IDEA Part B FFY 2017 SPP/APR, including input sessions, involved the following:

August 10, 2018: A presentation was conducted with personnel from the Division of Special Education comprised of case managers, related service providers and evaluators during a professional development day. The purpose of this session was to provide information on the respective Indicators, engage personnel in the discussion for possible reasons for the "slippage" for particular Indicators and to develop "next steps" to target the reasons for the slippage. This exercise assisted in the development of the FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

September 2018: Sessions were held with the six (6) GDOE high schools to review the data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14; along with reviewing the requirements for Indicator 13. Present at these meetings were the school administrators for each of the schools, the Transition Teachers from the schools, special education and general education teachers, and personnel from the Division of Special Education Transition Office comprised of Transition Teachers and Job Coaches.

August 2018 and September 2018: Work sessions were held with teachers from the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Preschool Program to review the results of Indicators 6 and 7. The work sessions involved a drill down of the data for the early childhood settings and the early childhood outcomes. As a result of these work sessions, the ECSE program developed an action plan to address the "slippage" for Indicator 7 that will be implemented during the school year.

October 2, 2018: A work session was held with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(GAPSD) to review data for Indicators 1, 2, and 4. Progress data was reviewed and members provided input for each of the Indicators discussed, especially where "slippage" occurred for Indicator 2. An explanation for "slippage" was discussed with the members to determine how best to address the reasons for students with disabilities who decide to dropout from school.

October 16, 2018: A work session was held with members from the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) to review data for Indicators 5, 6, 11, 12 and 13. The progress and compliance data was reviewed for each Indicator. An explanation for the "slippage" for Indicator 11 was discussed and next steps were determined to tighten up the standards of practice implemented within the Division to ensure that compliance is met for this particular Indicator. Drill down data was provided for Indicator 13. Members wanted further discussion for this particular Indicator because of the "slippage."

November 13, 2017: A work session was held with members from the GAPSD to review data for Indicators 11, 15 and 16. Compliance data for Indicator 11 was reviewed and members were given the opportunity to provide input and recommendations to address the "slippage" and the reasons for not meeting the 100% compliance for Indicator 11.

November 27, 2018: A work session was held with members from the GAPSD to review data for Indicators 3, 6 and 7. The "slippage" was addressed for Indicators 3 and 7, along with the action plan that was developed by the ECSE Program to address the "slippage."

December 6, 2018: A work session was held with members from the GAPSD to review data for Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14. The "slippage" was addressed for Indicators 2 and 13 after "drill down" data was presented. The Division, along with the CMO, is working closely with the schools to ensure they are on track to meet the requirements for Indicator 13, most especially.

January 8, 2019: At a regularly scheduled GAPSD meeting, Indicator 8 was reviewed and discussed with members. Advisory panel members provided several suggestions to increase the response rate of the Parent Survey for the next reporting period. Members agreed that the "slippage" for Indicator 8 may be indicative of how parents actually feel about how schools assist them with meeting the needs of their children with disabilities. Parents who are advisory panel members feel that the training sessions provided by GDOE are well thought out and timely; parents believe, however, that GDOE needs to come up with solutions to increase parent participation in the training sessions offered to families.

January 26, 2019: A general stakeholder meeting was held to present progress data for all SPP Indicators for the purposes of gathering input. Those present at the stakeholder meeting included parents, which included parents who are members of Guam Part B's state advisory panel or parent groups, personnel from the Division of Special Education, and other interested individuals. Each SPP/APR Indicator was discussed, most especially those Indicators where "slippage" occurred. Recommendations were proposed to address the "slippage" for those Indicators where "slippage" was noted.

January 21 - January 30, 2019: An electronic copy of the FFY 2017 SPP/APR in draft form was provided to all GDOE School Administrators in order to gather their input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred. This mechanism provided the Administrators time to review the FFY 2017 SPP/APR for the purposes of providing comments and/or suggestions for those Indicators where targets were not met and where "slippage" occurred. Administrators were instructed to provide their input and suggestions on or before January 31, 2019.

January 21 - January 30, 2019: An electronic and hard copy of the FFY 2017 SPP/APR in draft form was provided to all Guam Education Board (GEB) members in order to gather their input and recommendations for Indicators where "slippage" occurred. This mechanism provided the GEB members the opportunity to review the FFY 2017 SPP/APR for the purposes of providing comments and/or suggestions for those Indicators where targets were not met and where "slippage" occurred. GEB members were instructed to provide their input and suggestions on or before January 31, 2019.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 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 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 GRADS360 generated SPP/APR pdf version for public posting and the OSEP Determination Letter and Response Table on the GDOE website at www.gdoe.net (select "GDOE Links," under Division Links, select "Special Education," under Grants and Reports, click on "Guam Part B State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report"), including any revisions if Guam has revised its SPP. Guam posts its complete SPP and all APRs on the GDOE website.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

Guam's determinations for both 2017 and 2018 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2018 determination letter informed Guam that it must report with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2019, 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.

Guam was instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. Guam provided the required information.

Required Actions

Guam's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, Guam must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, Guam must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, Guam must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since Guam's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting Guam's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			55.00%	75.00%	75.00%	75.50%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	80.00%	81.00%
Data		62.00%	74.47%	65.00%	65.00%	82.50%	88.20%	85.20%	68.00%	83.72%	80.17%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	82.00%	83.00%
Data	82.52%	90.76%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	84.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	null	123
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	null	144
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table		Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

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

The GDOE Cohort Rate is calculated by dividing the total number of graduates, inclusive of the Summer 2017, by the number of graduates + dropouts for (12th Grade) SY 2016-2017 + dropouts for (11th Grade) SY 2015-2016 + dropouts for (10th Grade) SY 2014-2015 + dropouts for (9th Grade) SY 2013-2014.

Guam Part B uses the same formula employed by the GDOE to calculate the cohort rate for all students who have graduated. This equates to the following:

Total number of graduates, inclusive of Summer 2017 Graduates

=

123

x 100

=

85.42%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Total number of graduates, inclusive of the Summer 2017 graduates + (dropouts for 12th Grade in SY 2016-2017) + (dropouts for 11th Grade in SY 2015-2016) + (dropouts for 10th Grade in SY 2014-2015) + (dropouts for 9th Grade in SY 2013 - 2014) = 144

Data for computing SY2016-2017 was extracted from the Guam Part B 618 Table 4 Exit Report for July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017, and from the Division of Special Education's archived database. Since Guam Part B mirrors the methodology employed by GDOE for calculating the cohort rate for determining graduation rate, data collected for students graduating for school year 2016-2017 includes graduates from Summer 2017. It should therefore be noted that this reflection may differ from the 618 Exit report which reports for periods July 1st to June 30th.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
123	144	90.76%	84.00%	85.42%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

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

GDOE Board Policy #351.4 (11/27/00) states that graduates 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.

Guam Part B uses the GDOE Cohort Rate calculation for determining graduation rate for Indicator 1. Guam Part B did not select the "4-Year ACGR" option for graduation conditions.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0.70%	0.60%	0.60%	0.50%	0.50%	0.40%	0.30%	4.25%	4.00%
Data		8.00%	2.90%	1.20%	1.20%	2.28%	1.80%	1.19%	2.56%	4.25%	2.79%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	3.75%	3.50%
Data	1.97%	3.24%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.25%	1.19%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- ☐ Option 1
☐ Option 2

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

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of Youth with IEPs in the 9th through 12th Grade	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
30	829	3.24%	3.25%	3.62%

- ☒ Use a different calculation methodology
- ☐ Change numerator description in data table
- ☒ Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Based on the Part B Indicator Measurement for the FFY 2017 submission, Guam has chosen to utilize the same data source and measurement used in its FFY 2010 for its FFY 2017 Indicator 2 reporting. The data reported are therefore based on the FFY 2010 APR Indicator 2 measurement guidance.

FFY 2017 data for Indicator 2 was calculated by dividing the number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out (30) with the number of youth with IEPs in the 9th through 12th grade (829). This equates to $30/829 \times 100 = 3.62\%$, which is the data being reported for Indicator 2 for FFY 2017.

Additionally, as an outlying area, Guam does not report dropout data used in ESEA graduation rate calculation to the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Department under ESEA Title 1. Guam uses the number of dropouts in the 618 exit data (EDFacts File C009) and the high school enrollment for students with IEPs for calculating annual dropout rates. Per OSEP's instructions for FFY 2017, Guam will report FFY 2016 data (SY2016-2017) data and compare it to its FFY 2017 target for Indicator 2.

For this FFY reporting period, Guam Part B had 30 students with IEPs who dropped out of high school. The number of students with IEPs in the 9th through 12th grade was 829. Based on this data, the dropout rate for the period between July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017 for this reporting period for Guam Part B was 3.62%, which did not meet the FFY 2017 target of 3.25%.

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

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

Definition: A dropout is a person who

- Was enrolled in a GDOE high school sometime during a given school year; and
- After enrollment, stopped attending school without having been
 - transferred to another school or to a high school equivalency educational program recognized by the Department; or
 - incapacitated to the extent that enrollment in school or participation in an alternative high school program was possible; or
 - graduated from high school or completed an alternative high school program recognized by the Department, within six years of the first day of enrollment in ninth 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? No

Reasons for Slippage

Guam Part B offers the following as an explanation for the slippage in Indicator 2 for FFY 2017: The number of students dropping out during FFY 2017, which was 30 students, is four students more than what was reported during the FFY 2016 APR, which was 26 students. Guam's numbers are quite small; any slight increase or decrease will drastically change the percentages and performance.

In doing the drill down for the reasons for dropping out, the following is provided:

- Several students reported they had to leave school to take care of sick family members (bed-ridden mother, sick father, sick grandmother);
- Student's family moved to another school district and could not provide their own transportation to attend the district high school for the attendance area;
- Student decided to drop out because of age and did not have enough credits to earn a high school diploma; and
- One student who dropped out during this reporting period to take care of a sick family member has since re-enrolled in one of the GDOE High Schools to complete graduation requirements.

Guam Part B will continue to encourage its high school students to stay in school to earn a high school diploma and to remind schools to follow the process and procedures before students are allowed to drop out from high school, which includes additional steps in the process for students with IEPs.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

6/26/2019

Page 11 of 60

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				86.00%	89.00%	95.00%	100%	100%	100%	92.00%	93.00%
			Data		83.00%	75.10%	87.80%	90.50%	89.00%	95.00%	88.00%	93.20%	94.98%	86.25%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				86.00%	89.00%	95.00%	100%	100%	100%	92.00%	93.00%
			Data		85.00%	76.00%	91.40%	90.21%	89.00%	96.00%	91.20%	92.70%	94.98%	88.96%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	94.00%	95.00%
		Data	95.93%	96.12%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	94.00%	95.00%
		Data	95.83%	95.58%

Key: Gray -- Data Prior to Baseline Yellow -- Baseline Blue -- Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	96.00%	96.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	96.00%	96.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	1,053	999	96.12%	96.00%	94.87%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Guam Part B reports the following to explain the "slippage" in its participation rate for students with disabilities in Reading Assessment:

Drill down activities were conducted to determine the root cause for the "slippage" in participation for its students with disabilities in Reading participation. The following is a breakdown of the percentages of participation for each grade:

- 3rd Grade: 100% (84/84) Participation
- 4th Grade: 97.83% (135/138) Participation
- 5th Grade: 98.71% (153/155) Participation
- 6th Grade: 96.79% (151/156) Participation
- 7th Grade: 96.23% (153/159) Participation

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- 8th Grade: 93.79% (151/161) Participation
- HS Grade: 86.00% (172/200) Participation

Based on the breakdown, the High School participation rate was at 86%, which amounts to 28 high school students who were unable to participate in the assessment. Upon review of the tracking forms utilized to monitor student participation during the assessment period, it was discovered that several of the students were absent from school for various reasons, which included being off-island to seek medical treatment.

Although GDOE schools have a six-week period to conduct assessments, each school selects when they would conduct the assessments during the six-week period, which is usually a one (1) to two (2) week period. For those students who did not participate during their schools' assessment period due to absences, there are no other opportunities for these students to make-up the assessment once the selected assessment period of their school has been completed. Schools are required to submit all assessment protocols to the GDOE Assessment Office and are not allowed to conduct make-up assessments anytime afterwards.

GDOE will continue to monitor the participation rate of its students with disabilities during the assessment period in each of the schools through the tracking forms developed for this purpose.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	1,053	1,006	95.58%	96.00%	95.54%

Public Reporting Information

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

Information on the participation and performance of students with disabilities is reported in the SY2017-2018 Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER) on the Guam Department of Education's (GDOE) website. This report can be found on the GDOE website at www.gdoe.net (Click on Annual State of Public Education Report - ASPER). Additional assessment information for students with disabilities could also be found in the report titled, Department of Education, Division of Special Education: School Performance Report Card (SPRC) - Disaggregated by Students with Disabilities for SY2017-2018 on the GDOE website at www.gdoe.net (Click on Department of Education School Performance Report Card - Disaggregated by Students with Disabilities for SY2017-2018).

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response**Required Actions**

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				40.00%	50.00%	60.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	2.25%	2.50%
			Data		3.13%	3.08%	1.53%	3.15%	1.76%	4.08%	2.24%	1.41%	4.21%	2.85%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				40.00%	50.00%	60.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	2.25%	2.50%
			Data		2.90%	3.16%	1.33%	2.21%	2.05%	3.67%	1.95%	0.83%	2.55%	2.96%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	4.00%	6.00%
		Data	3.36%	14.27%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	4.00%	6.00%
		Data	3.95%	12.75%


Key:  Gray -- Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow -- Baseline  Blue -- Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	8.00%	10.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	8.00%	10.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	999	28	14.27%	8.00%	2.80%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Based on Guam's performance for FFY 2017 with 2.80% in Reading and 3.58% in Math, Guam Part B did not meet the 8.0% target determined for Indicator 3C in Reading and Math. This performance represents "slippage" for this reporting period.

Guam Part B did an analysis to determine the reasons that could be attributed to the slippage in the performance for Reading and Math. The analysis included a review of:

- procedures for the administration of required accommodations for participating in the district-wide assessments: ACT Aspire and Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA);
- proficiency results between children with disabilities and children without disabilities in the ACT Aspire assessment for SY2016-2017 and SY2017-2018; and

- district-wide initiatives for improving evidence-based practices.

Administration of Required Accommodations

As reported in 3B, the majority of children with disabilities participating in the district-wide assessments require accommodations. Guam Part B therefore reviewed the procedures for providing required accommodations during the district-wide assessments to ensure that the procedures were implemented accordingly. Prior to the administration of the district-wide assessments, the Division of Special Education Data Office provides a report to each school that lists the accommodations needed for each student with a disability in order to participate in the district-wide assessment. The school site assessment coordinator then enters and uploads the needed accommodations in the students' personal profile in the ACT Aspire portal for all ACT Aspire assessments. This practice ensures that all students with IEPs are provided the accommodations needed in order for them to participate appropriately in the ACT Aspire with the selected accommodations deemed necessary by the IEP teams of each student with an IEP.

Guam Part B reviewed the ACT Aspire and MSAA administration procedures during the Spring 2018 assessment and did not find any issues that would invalidate the assessment results.

Comparison of Year-to-Year Results Between Children with Disabilities and Children without Disabilities

Guam Part B reviewed proficiency data for children with disabilities and children without disabilities in the district-wide assessments by grades in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. Overall, the performance for students in the Guam Department of Education (GDOE), inclusive of children with disabilities, indicates that all GDOE students are not reaching benchmark in either Reading or Math in the district-wide assessment.

Overall, for grades 3-8 and high school, children without disabilities showed slight increases in proficiency performance for Reading and Math from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018; whereas, children with disabilities showed a marked decrease in proficiency performance from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018.

District-Wide Initiatives

Guam Part B, in collaboration with the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, continues to receive feedback from general education and special education teachers regarding supports needed for implementing evidence-based reading and math practices. Guam's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) target schools have been a source for the feedback. For each district-level professional development, inclusive of the SSIP activities, session evaluations and implementation fidelity checks are reviewed to determine next steps.

Feedback received communicated the need for continued training and supports in the content area, such as increasing knowledge and skills in Reading and Math, and on accommodations and adaptations for students with disabilities. Guam's SSIP targets improving reading achievement in the elementary grades with a focus on the early grades. The SSIP school teachers have conveyed their needs for continued training on the use of data for improving instructional decisions, implementation of the *Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA)* improvement cycle, and implementation of the reading components.

Based on the analysis to determine the reasons that could be attributed to the slippage in the performance for Reading and Math, with stakeholder input, Guam Part B determined that a major reason for the slippage is the continual need for professional development, including school-level supports that focus on improving core instruction and tiered interventions.

As this is a system-wide dilemma, the GDOE has implemented several initiatives to target the low performance in Reading and Math. With the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the development of the GDOE State Strategic Plan, there has been an increase in teacher preparation and professional development at the district level. As it is the responsibility of each school to have a guaranteed and viable curriculum, curriculum consensus maps and lesson plans have been developed for teachers to follow and implement each quarter of the school year. The premise behind the consistency with the curriculum consensus maps and lesson plans is to assist teachers with ensuring that core standards are taught to target the deficit areas for students and that a guaranteed and viable curriculum is implemented in the classrooms.

Evidence-based practices such as *Classroom Instruction that Works (CITW)*, the *Five Big Ideas for Reading*, and *Singapore Math* are also implemented in the elementary schools. Moreover, each elementary school has dedicated time scheduled for its Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) so teachers are afforded the opportunity to receive mini-PD sessions on site.

GDOE also has a district-wide screener, *AIMSWeb*, in which all elementary and middle schools conduct three times annually with its students, inclusive of students with disabilities. In learning from the implementation of the State Systemic Plan in four of its elementary schools, it was noted that teachers do not consistently use the data from the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

screeners to make informed decisions with regards to intervention strategies that will target skill gaps with their students. Using the continuous improvement process, *Plan, Study, Do, Act, (PDSA)* is also another strategy that the four SSIP schools have undertaken to increase the academic outcomes for its struggling learners. As a result, plans are underway for the SSIP School Administrators to share this continuous improvement process with the remaining School Administrators so that PDSA will be implemented in more schools.

Additionally, to support teachers with their struggling learners, technical assistance and training and support is provided to general education and special education teachers in order for them to provide “Core – Plus” instruction to students with IEPs. These training sessions and technical assistance is provided by the Consulting Resource Teachers/Technical Assistants from the Division of Special Education, as there is a continued need to increase training to teachers who provide instruction to students with disabilities in the use of accommodations and modifications so students with disabilities could access grade level general education curriculum.

Furthermore, this year and moving forward, there will be continued training and support to teachers to address the “specially designed instruction” for students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and how students with disabilities will access general education grade level curriculum.

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	1,006	36	12.75%	8.00%	3.58%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

Based on Guam's performance for FFY 2017 with 2.80% in Reading and 3.58% in Math, Guam Part B did not meet the 8.0% target determined for Indicator 3C in Reading and Math. This performance represents “slippage” for this reporting period.

Guam Part B did an analysis to determine the reasons that could be attributed to the slippage in the performance for Reading and Math. The analysis included a review of:

- procedures for the administration of required accommodations for participating in the district-wide assessments: ACT Aspire and Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA);
- proficiency results between children with disabilities and children without disabilities in the ACT Aspire assessment for SY2016-2017 and SY2017-2018; and
- district-wide initiatives for improving evidence-based practices.

Administration of Required Accommodations

As reported in 3B, the majority of children with disabilities participating in the district-wide assessments require accommodations. Guam Part B therefore reviewed the procedures for providing required accommodations during the district-wide assessments to ensure that the procedures were implemented accordingly. Prior to the administration of the district-wide assessments, the Division of Special Education Data Office provides a report to each school that lists the accommodations needed for each student with a disability in order to participate in the district-wide assessment. The school site assessment coordinator then enters and uploads the needed accommodations in the students' personal profile in the ACT Aspire portal for all ACT Aspire assessments. This practice ensures that all students with IEPs are provided the accommodations needed in order for them to participate appropriately in the ACT Aspire with the selected accommodations deemed necessary by the IEP teams of each student with an IEP.

Guam Part B reviewed the ACT Aspire and MSAA administration procedures during the Spring 2018 assessment and did not find any issues that would invalidate the assessment results.

Comparison of Year-to-Year Results Between Children with Disabilities and Children without Disabilities

Guam Part B reviewed proficiency data for children with disabilities and children without disabilities in the district-wide assessments by grades in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. Overall, the performance for students in the Guam Department of Education (GDOE), inclusive of children with disabilities, indicates that all GDOE students are not reaching benchmark in either Reading or Math in the district-wide assessment.

Overall, for grades 3-8 and high school, children without disabilities showed slight increases in proficiency performance for Reading and Math from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018; whereas, children with disabilities showed a marked decrease in proficiency performance from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018.

District-Wide Initiatives

Guam Part B, in collaboration with the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, continues to receive feedback from general education and special education teachers regarding supports needed for implementing evidence-based reading and math practices. Guam's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) target schools have been a source for the feedback. For each district-level professional development, inclusive of the SSIP activities, session evaluations and implementation fidelity checks are reviewed to determine next steps.

Feedback received communicated the need for continued training and supports in the content area, such as increasing knowledge and skills in Reading and Math, and on accommodations and adaptations for students with disabilities. Guam's SSIP targets improving reading achievement in the elementary grades with a focus on the early grades. The SSIP school teachers have conveyed their needs for continued training on the use of data for improving instructional decisions, implementation of the *Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA)* improvement cycle, and implementation of the reading components.

Based on the analysis to determine the reasons that could be attributed to the slippage in the performance for Reading and Math, with stakeholder input, Guam Part B determined that a major reason for the slippage is the continual need for professional development, including school-level supports that focus on improving core instruction and tiered interventions.

As this is a system-wide dilemma, the GDOE has implemented several initiatives to target the low performance in Reading and Math. With the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the development of the GDOE State Strategic Plan, there has been an increase in teacher preparation and professional development at the district level. As it is the responsibility of each school to have a guaranteed and viable curriculum, curriculum consensus maps and lesson plans have been developed for teachers to follow and implement each quarter of the school year. The premise behind the consistency with the curriculum consensus maps and lesson plans is to assist teachers with ensuring that core standards are taught to target the deficit areas for students and that a guaranteed and viable curriculum is implemented in the classrooms.

Evidence-based practices such as *Classroom Instruction that Works (CITW)*, the *Five Big Ideas for Reading*, and *Singapore Math* are also implemented in the elementary schools. Moreover, each elementary school has dedicated time scheduled for its Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) so teachers are afforded the opportunity to receive mini-PD sessions on site.

GDOE also has a district-wide screener, *AIMSweb*, in which all elementary and middle schools conduct three times annually with its students, inclusive of students with disabilities. In learning from the implementation of the State Systemic Plan in four of its elementary schools, it was noted that teachers do not consistently use the data from the screeners to make informed decisions with regards to intervention strategies that will target skill gaps with their students. Using the continuous improvement process, *Plan, Study, Do, Act, (PDSA)* is also another strategy that the four SSIP schools have undertaken to increase the academic outcomes for its struggling learners. As a result, plans are underway for the SSIP School Administrators to share this continuous improvement process with the remaining School Administrators so that PDSA will be implemented in more schools.

Additionally, to support teachers with their struggling learners, technical assistance and training and support is provided to general education and special education teachers in order for them to provide "Core – Plus" instruction to students with IEPs. These training sessions and technical assistance is provided by the Consulting Resource Teachers/Technical Assistants from the Division of Special Education, as there is a continued need to increase training to teachers who provide instruction to students with disabilities in the use of accommodations and modifications so students with disabilities could access grade level general education curriculum.

Furthermore, this year and moving forward, there will be continued training and support to teachers to address the "specially designed instruction" for students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and how students with disabilities will access general education grade level curriculum.

Public Reporting Information

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

Information on the participation and performance of students with disabilities is reported in the SY2017-2018 Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER) on the Guam Department of Education's (GDOE) website. This report can be found on the GDOE website at www.gdoe.net (Click on Annual State of Public Education Report - ASPER). Additional assessment information for students with disabilities could also be found in the report titled, Department of Education, Division of Special Education: School Performance Report Card (SPRC) - Disaggregated by Students with Disabilities for SY2017-2018 on the GDOE website through the following link - <https://sites.google.com/a/gdoe.net/division-of-special-education/grants-reports> (Click on the folder titled "DOE SPED Schools Report Card SY2017-2018).

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State must report, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the school level.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response

For the FFY 2017 APP/APR reporting period, Guam Part B provides the following information demonstrating that Guam reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, Guam must report, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities in regular assessments and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards at the school level.

Public Reporting Information

Information on the participation and performance of students with disabilities is reported in the SY2017-2018 Annual State of Public Education Report (ASPER) on the Guam Department of Education's (GDOE) website. This report can be found on the GDOE website at www.gdoe.net (Click on Annual State of Public Education Report - ASPER). Additional assessment information for students with disabilities could also be found in the report titled, Department of Education, Division of Special Education: School Performance Report Card (SPRC) - Disaggregated by Students with Disabilities for SY2017-2018 on the GDOE website through the following link - <https://sites.google.com/a/gdoe.net/division-of-special-education/grants-reports> (Click on the folder titled "DOE SPED Schools Report Card SY2017-2018).

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.10%	3.38%	0.40%	0.40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	1	0%	0%	0%

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

- ☒ Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
☐ 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.

Based on this performance and its definition of "significant discrepancy," Guam Part B has met the targets for Indicator 4A for this FFY 2017 APR reporting period.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Enrollment data was taken from the official GDOE Student Enrollment, as of September 30th of each year.

	Reported Suspension and Expulsion Data		
	2016-2017		
	# of Students	# Susp/Expul >10 days	% of Susp/ Expul
Children without disabilities	28,292	1172	4.14%
Children with disabilities	1952	153	7.84%
All children	30,244	1325	4.38%

Using data from FFY 2016 (2016-2017) displayed in the table above and given the definition for significant discrepancy, regular education students had a rate of 4.14% long term suspensions or expulsions for greater than ten (10) days. Three (3) times that rate equates to 12.42%. Students with disabilities had a rate of 7.84% long term suspensions or expulsions for greater than 10 days. This rate falls well below the significant discrepancy definition. This illustrates that special education students are not being subjected to long term suspension or expulsion at a significant rate compared to students without disabilities.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

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

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

In FFY 2017, Guam did not report a "significant discrepancy."

Thus, for FFY 2017, Guam did not identify any 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)

☐ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
 - B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
- (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			42.00%	55.00%	70.00%	85.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	43.00%	46.00%
		Data		36.00%	38.00%	41.00%	42.00%	45.00%	42.00%	40.00%	43.00%	43.89%	45.06%
B	2005	Target ≤			25.00%	20.00%	12.00%	34.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	13.00%	12.00%
		Data		29.00%	30.00%	33.00%	34.00%	34.00%	33.00%	26.00%	13.00%	10.29%	8.09%
C	2005	Target ≤			0.04%	0.90%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	0.04%	1.50%	1.50%
		Data		0%	0.30%	0%	0.55%	0.32%	0.33%	0.50%	0.45%	1.09%	0.06%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	48.00%	50.00%
	Data	46.88%	45.47%
B	Target ≤	11.00%	10.00%
	Data	6.02%	4.89%
C	Target ≤	1.50%	1.50%
	Data	0.06%	0.06%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥		44.50%
Target B ≤		3.50%
Target C ≤		0.10%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

During the April 2019 FFY 2017 APR clarification period, OSEP stated that Guam Part B cannot use the Indicator 5 alternate data for the total number of children with IEPs aged 6-21 as the denominator in its Indicator 5 calculation because the parentally placed children with disabilities who are receiving special education and related services through a service plan are counted in the Part B Child Count and Educational Environment data and should be included in the denominator. OSEP therefore instructed Guam Part B to change its method for determining the total number of children with IEPs aged 6-21 and utilize the Part B Educational Environment data. In previous APRs, Guam Part B deleted the number of parentally placed children with disabilities from the denominator because these children did not have an IEP, as described in the indicator measurement.

Based on OSEP's instruction to change Guam Part B's method for calculating Indicator 5 performance, Guam Part B is re-establishing baseline for Indicator 5 in this FFY 2017 APR.

The targets established for FFY 2018 were based on a review of Guam Part B's trend data using the Part B Educational Environment data. Guam Part B has made slight increases over time for Indicator 5A from a December 1, 2014 performance of 43.56% to the current 44.21% December 1, 2017 performance. Of significance is Guam Part B's trend data for 5B from a 7.82% December 1, 2014 performance to 3.79% on December 1, 2017, which is better than the national average for 5B. For 5C, the trend has also represented significantly better percentages than the national average from a 0.05% on December 1, 2014 to 0.11% on December 1, 2017.

Based on the review of Guam Part B's Indicator 5 trend data using the required OSEP Educational Environment data for calculating performance, and with input from stakeholders, Guam Part B determined its targets for Indicator 5, as reflected in Targets section of this Indicator.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

☐ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	1,848	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	817	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	70	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	817	1,848	45.47%		44.21%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	70	1,848	4.89%		3.79%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2	1,848	0.06%		0.11%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the April 2019 FFY 2017 APR clarification period, OSEP stated that Guam Part B cannot use the Indicator 5 alternate data for the total number of children with IEPs aged 6-21 as the denominator in its Indicator 5 calculation because the parentally placed children with disabilities who are receiving special education and related services through a service plan are counted in the Part B Child Count and Educational Environment data and should be included in the denominator. OSEP therefore instructed Guam Part B to change its method for determining the total number of children with IEPs aged 6-21 and utilize the Part B Educational Environment data. In previous APRs, Guam Part B deleted the number of parentally placed children with disabilities from the denominator because these children did not have an IEP, as described in the indicator measurement.

Based on OSEP's instruction to change Guam Part B's method for calculating Indicator 5 performance, Guam Part B is re-establishing baseline for Indicator 5 in this FFY 2017 APR.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Guam has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2017, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Guam revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									65.00%	55.42%	58.00%
		Data								64.25%	55.00%	55.42%	50.88%
B	2011	Target ≤									10.00%	12.05%	11.00%
		Data								10.61%	14.00%	12.05%	11.11%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	60.00%	62.00%
	Data	54.72%	61.21%
B	Target ≤	11.00%	10.00%
	Data	11.32%	13.94%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	64.00%	66.00%
Target B ≤	10.00%	9.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	167	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	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	106	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	9	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early	106	167	61.21%	64.00%	63.47%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	9	167	13.94%	10.00%	5.39%

☐
Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						71.30%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%	84.78%	84.78%
		Data					71.00%	76.20%	73.90%	81.40%	75.40%	84.78%	65.08%
A2	2008	Target ≥						57.60%	65.50%	66.00%	66.50%	29.79%	29.79%
		Data					57.50%	65.00%	55.00%	67.20%	52.20%	29.79%	35.71%
B1	2008	Target ≥						80.30%	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	85.11%	85.11%
		Data					80.00%	76.20%	74.50%	82.00%	71.20%	85.11%	73.13%
B2	2008	Target ≥						48.00%	58.80%	59.30%	59.80%	23.40%	23.40%
		Data					47.50%	58.30%	38.30%	46.60%	42.00%	23.40%	24.29%
C1	2008	Target ≥						89.50%	89.70%	90.00%	90.50%	80.00%	80.00%
		Data					89.30%	81.80%	66.70%	86.80%	72.20%	80.00%	69.70%
C2	2008	Target ≥						70.10%	72.20%	72.70%	73.20%	36.17%	36.71%
		Data					70.00%	71.70%	65.00%	65.50%	60.90%	36.17%	38.57%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
	Data	74.14%	76.92%
A2	Target ≥	39.00%	39.00%
	Data	31.67%	21.21%
B1	Target ≥	85.50%	85.50%
	Data	79.31%	80.00%
B2	Target ≥	34.00%	34.00%
	Data	30.00%	16.67%
C1	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
	Data	79.31%	75.00%
C2	Target ≥	40.00%	40.00%
	Data	40.00%	30.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.50%	85.50%
Target A2 ≥	57.50%	57.51%
Target B1 ≥	86.00%	86.00%
Target B2 ≥	47.50%	47.51%
Target C1 ≥	89.31%	89.32%
Target C2 ≥	70.00%	70.01%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	61
--	----

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	17	27.87%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	26	42.62%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	14	22.95%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4	6.56%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	40.00	57.00	76.92%	85.50%	70.18%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	18.00	61.00	21.21%	57.50%	29.51%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

Guam Part B provides the following explanation for the "slippage" in 7A1-SS1:

- Guam DID NOT meet the target for 7A1 SS1 with its performance of 70.18%.
- Guam showed slippage in the performance for FFY 2017 by 6.74% in comparison to the FFY 2016 performance of 76.92%.

Guam Part B's performance this year for 7A1-SS1 was at 70.18%. There were a total of 57 out of the 61 preschoolers that participated in the child outcome measurement that were in categories a, b, c, and d that exited the preschool program below age expectation in the area of positive social emotional skills, including social relationships. Of the 57, there were 26 preschoolers in category "c" and 14 preschoolers in category "d" with a total of 40 preschoolers that demonstrated substantial increase in their rate of growth in positive social emotional skills. This resulted with Guam's performance at 70.18% which is a slippage of 6.74% in comparison to FFY 2016 performance of 76.92%. There were a total of 61 preschoolers with IEPs that participated in the early childhood outcome measurement.

The Early Childhood Preschool Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the seventeen or 27.29% of the preschoolers that were in category "b" to determine if they are children who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning, comparable to same age peers in the area of positive social emotional skills. The following data points were reviewed:

- Age at Entry
- Length of service
- Disability
- Setting data

Based on the data drill down, 9 out of the 17 preschoolers were 3 years of age, 5 preschoolers were four years of age and three preschoolers were five years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education services.

The following data points were analyzed:

- Length of services. Eight out of the 17 preschoolers received early childhood special education services for less than 12 months of services; 8 preschoolers received less than 24 months of services, and one preschooler received more than 24 months of services.
- Disability. Six of the 17 were identified as developmental delay; one was eligible as Speech and Language delayed; 7 preschoolers were identified as having autism; and 3 preschoolers were eligible as other health impairment;
- Settings/Placement. Ten of the preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; two preschoolers were in the ECSE classroom; 1 in a typical preschool setting; and 4 received services in the home.

Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- There are children with specific conditions such as autism that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports;
- Provide supports and continued training for service providers in age anchoring skills and strategies to support the progression of skills that are needed to support preschoolers improve their skills closer to same age peers; and
- Work in partnership with Head Start teachers in understanding and working closely on strategies to support the 3 child outcomes.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1	1.64%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	14	22.95%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	29	47.54%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	16	26.23%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	1.64%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	45.00	60.00	80.00%	86.00%	75.00%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	17.00	61.00	16.67%	47.50%	27.87%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

Guam Part B provides the following explanation for the "slippage" in 7B1-SS1:

- Guam DID NOT meet the target for 7B1-SS2 with its performance of 75.00%.
- Guam showed slippage in the performance for FFY 2017 by 5% in comparison to the FFY 2016 performance of 80.00%.

Guam's performance for this reporting year was 75%. There were a total of 60 out of the 61 of preschoolers that participated in the child outcome measurement that were in categories a, b, c, and d that exited the preschool program below age expectation in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills. Of the 61, there were 29 preschoolers in category "c" and 16 preschoolers in category "d" with a total of 45 preschoolers that demonstrated substantial increase in their rate of growth in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills which resulted in Guam's performance at 75%. This is a slippage of 5% in comparison to FFY 2016 performance of 80%.

The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of fourteen or 23% of the preschoolers that were in category "b" who are children who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning, comparable to same age peers in the acquisition of knowledge and skills. The following data points were reviewed:

- Age at Entry
- Length of service
- Disability
- Setting data

Based on the data drill down, 6 out of the 14 preschoolers were 3 years of age, 6 preschoolers were four years of age and two preschoolers were five years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education services.

The following data points were analyzed:

- Length of services. Eight out of the 14 preschoolers received early childhood special education services for less than 12 months of services; and 6 preschoolers received less than 24 months of services.
- Disability. Five of the 14 were identified as developmental delay; one was eligible with a Speech and Language delay; 6 preschoolers were identified as having autism; and 2 preschoolers were eligible as other health impairment.
- Settings/Placement. Seven of the preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; two preschoolers were in the ECSE classroom; 1 in a typical preschool setting; and 4 received services in the home.

Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- There are children with specific conditions such as autism that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports;
- Provide supports and continued training for service providers in age anchoring skills and strategies to support the progression of skills that are needed to support preschoolers improve their skills closer to same age peers; and
- Work in partnership with Head Start teachers in understanding and working closely on strategies to support the 3 child outcomes.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	23	37.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	18	29.51%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	16	26.23%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4	6.56%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	34.00	57.00	75.00%	89.31%	59.65%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	20.00	61.00	30.30%	70.00%	32.79%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

Guam Part B provides the following for the explanation of "slippage" for 7C1-SS1:

- Guam DID NOT Meet the target for FFY 2017 with its performance of 59.65%
- Guam showed slippage in the performance for FFY 2017 by 15.35% in comparison to the FFY 2016 performance of 75.00%.

Guam's performance for this reporting year was 59.65%. There were a total of 57 out of the 61 of preschoolers that participated in the child outcome measurement that were in categories a, b, c, and d that exited the preschool program below age expectation in the area of using appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. Of the 61, there were 18 preschoolers in category "c" and 16 preschoolers in category "d" with a total of 34 preschoolers that demonstrated substantial increase in their rate of growth using appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. This resulted with Guam's performance at 59.67%, which is a slippage of 15.35% in comparison to FFY 2016 performance of 75.00%.

The Program specifically reviewed and analyzed data of the twenty-three or 37.7% of the preschoolers that were in category "b" which were children who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning, comparable to same age peers in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. The following data points were reviewed:

- Age at Entry
- Length of service
- Disability
- Setting data

Based on the data drill down, 13 out of the 23 preschoolers were 3 years of age, 8 preschoolers were four years of age and two preschoolers were five years of age when they began receiving early childhood special education services.

The following data points were analyzed:

- Length of services. Nine out of the 23 preschoolers received early childhood special education services for less than 12 months of services; 13 preschoolers received less than 24 months of services, and one preschooler received more than 24 months of services.
- Disability. Seven of the 23 were identified as developmental delay; three were eligible as Speech and Language delay; 10 preschoolers were identified as having autism; and 3 preschoolers were eligible as other health impairment;
- Settings/Placement. Fourteen of the preschoolers received services in a Head Start setting; three preschoolers

were in the ECSE classroom; 1 in a typical preschool setting; and 5 received services in the home.

Stakeholders discussed the potential reasons for slippage and actions steps:

- There are children with specific conditions such as autism that will continue to need specialized instruction and supports;
- Provide supports and continued training to service providers in age anchoring skills and strategies to support the progression of skills that are needed to support preschoolers improve their skills closer to same age peers; and
- Work in partnership with Head Start teachers in understanding and working closely on strategies to support the 3 child outcomes.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

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

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

- The summary information for child outcomes is expected to take into account the child's functioning across a full range of situations and settings. Information from many individuals in contact with the child is considered in deciding on the rating for each outcome. These may include *but not be limited to* the following:
 - Parents
 - Early Childhood Special Education or Head Start Teachers
 - Related Service Providers
 - Child Care Provider (if appropriate)
 - Other Early Childhood Providers (If appropriate)
- Many types of information are used in determining the child's status relative to the child outcomes. These may include *but not be limited to*:
 - Parent input/observation
 - Service Provider/s observation
 - Curriculum based assessments such as the—
 - Teaching Strategies Gold Creative Curriculum
 - Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
 - Guam Early Learning Guidelines (3 to 5 Years)
 - Child progress reports from Service Providers
- Information about each outcome is reflected in the child's present level of academic achievement and functional performance across typical settings and situations that make up his/her daily routines.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			62.00%	72.00%	82.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	71.91%	76.00%
Data		62.00%	70.00%	60.00%	72.00%	83.10%	75.00%	76.00%	78.20%	71.91%	82.02%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%
Data	86.17%	92.74%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	84.00%	86.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
339	475	92.74%	84.00%	71.37%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	24.78%	1917.00
---	--------	---------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Reasons for Slippage

For the FFY 2017 APR reporting period, Guam Part B performed at 71.37% (339/475). This performance is noted as “slippage” from last year’s FFY 2016 performance of 92.74% (345/372).

The Division of Special Education reviewed the results of the survey with the members of the Guam Advisory Panel for Students with Disabilities (GAPSD) and other stakeholders. The GAPSD parent members contributed to the design and dissemination of the survey. GAPSD members reviewed the results and discussed reasons for slippage. GAPSD and other stakeholders from the Stakeholder Presentation on January 26, 2019 shared their perspectives on why there was a decrease in performance for Indicator 8.

With stakeholder input, Guam Part B attributes the following as reasons for the “slippage” with its Indicator 8 performance:

Within the past year, there have been quite a number of public awareness and parent training sessions offered by the various parent groups on Guam. These parent groups – *Autism Communities Together (ACT)* and *Parents Empowering Parents (PEP)* – have provided training sessions for parents and guardians of children with disabilities. It

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

should be noted that many of the training sessions were facilitated by personnel from the Division of Special Education, which included training sessions on the IEP Process and the Secondary Transition Process. With the increased awareness and information, parents and guardians have become more vocal with regards to their opinions about how their child's school gives them the help they need to play an active role in their child's education.

To increase its performance with Indicator 8, Guam Part B will continue to collaborate with the parent groups and partner together to assist in all training efforts in order to expand parent awareness and provide support. Guam Part B will also increase its training efforts with school personnel to ensure they are equipped to assist parents in playing an active role in their child's education.

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.

Response Rate:

In FFY 2017, Indicator 8 parent surveys returned represented 27.23% (522/1917) of the parent surveys disseminated. For the Indicator 8 measure, survey item #5 was used to determine Guam Part B's performance, as in previous years. The review of survey item #5 responses resulted in 47 surveys not included in the analysis for Guam Part B's FFY 2017 performance: 27 surveys with "not applicable," 18 surveys with no response, and two surveys with invalid responses. The response rate for Indicator 8 therefore was 24.78% (475/1917), which included completed surveys with a valid response for survey item #5. Guam Part B's response rate of 24.78% (475/1917) represented a 6.11% increase in response rate from 18.67% (372/1993) in FFY 2016.

Parent Survey Dissemination & Collection:

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 in special education. However, if a parent had more than one child in a specific level (elementary, middle, or high), only one survey was disseminated to the parent. If a parent also had a child in either middle or high school, the parent also received a survey for the child at that level.

A listing of the active (A) and waiting (W) students by school was obtained in March 2018. This list included the preschoolers with IEPs in their respective school listing. All preschoolers with IEPs are assigned to an elementary school within their district. The first dissemination involved sending home the IDEA Part B Parent Survey along with a cover letter. The surveys were delivered to the parent through his/her child starting in the first week of April 2018. The second dissemination delivered by the second week of May for non-respondents of the first dissemination.

Each parent was provided the following options to return the completed survey:

- By mail
- Return to School Principal
- Return to the Division of Special Education, Parent Services Program
- E-mail to UOG CEDDERS Survey Consultant

Parents were also provided the opportunity to complete the survey on-line. For FFY 2017, 18 surveys were completed on-line. This was a decrease from FFY 2016 in which 24 surveys were completed on-line.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

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

Guam Part B reports that its FFY 2017 Indicator 8 parent respondents are representative of the demographics of

children receiving special education services. The analysis of the extent of the representation includes the following:

Representation of Parents by Ethnicity

It should be noted that, overall, the IDEA ethnic category of "Asian/Pacific Islanders" represented the majority survey respondents, as expected from Guam's school and community population.

The ethnic categories of the survey were aligned with the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) Data Dictionary for ethnic categories with the "Chamorro" category combined with the "CNMI Chamorro" combined as one. There were a total of 10 surveys with no response which accounted for 1.92% (10/522) of the total surveys received. There were a total of 9 surveys with an "invalid" response which accounted for 1.72% (9/522) of the total surveys received.

When comparing the population breakdown with the breakdown of the survey respondents, all ethnic categories were represented in the survey with the exception of American Indian/Alaskan, Hispanics, Japanese, Kosraean, and Indonesian. The Chamorro group made up 62.8% of the students with disabilities and represented the majority of survey respondents with 48.47% (253/522) representation. The Chuukese group made up 13% of the student with disabilities population and obtained a 5.00% (26/522) response rate. Please note that there were respondents who did not complete the ethnicity item on the survey. Also, ethnicity identity based on school records might be different from an individual respondent's ethnicity selection.

Representation of Parents by Village

In a review of the respondents by village with the child count by village, 18 of the 19 villages were represented by the respondents because there were no respondents from the village of Umatac. There were 22 surveys with "no response" for this item on the survey which accounted for 4.21% (22/522) of the total surveys received and there was one invalid response which accounted for 0.20% (1/522) of the total surveys received. Of the surveys received, the percentage of valid responses to the item identifying the village was 95.59% (499/522).

There were no significant differences between the child count by village and the survey respondents by village for five of the 19 villages. Please note that the respondents that did not respond to this survey item may be from one of the other villages.

Representation of Parents by School

Every school, with the exception of Merizo Martyrs Elementary School, JP Torres Success Academy, and the Guahan Charter School, was represented in the survey. However, there were 57 surveys with "no school" indicated and five surveys with an invalid response which accounted for 11.88% (62/522) of the total surveys received. One survey indicated "Home School," while three surveys indicated the "iLearn Academy" as the school.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		44.00%	51.00%	81.00%	95.00%	100%	100%	99.69%	100%	98.26%	96.94%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.68%	93.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
243	227	93.49%	100%	93.42%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	16
---	----

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.

In FFY 2017, reporting period 7/1/2017 to 6/30/2018, there were a total of 243 children for whom parental consents to evaluate were received during this reporting period.

Of the 243 parental consents received, 227 were evaluated within the 60-Day timeline. There are sixteen (16) children to report in the "Account For" category described below:

Number of Students	Number of Days after 60-Day Timeline	Reasons for Delay
6	1-30 days after 60-day timeline	Program Delay
10	31-60 days after 60-day timeline	Program Delay
16	TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	

Of the sixteen (16) children in the "Account For" category, all sixteen had their initial evaluations completed as follows:

- Three (3) children required an Autism assessment as part of their initial evaluation. All three autism evaluations

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

were completed 1-30 days after the 60-Day timeline. All three children were determined eligible for special education and related services and are currently receiving special education and related services;

- Three (3) children required Psycho-educational evaluations as part of their initial evaluation. All three children had these evaluations completed 1-30 days after the 60-Day timeline. All three children were determined eligible for special education and related services and are currently receiving special education and related services;
- The remaining ten (10) children required an Occupational Therapy (OT) assessment as part of their initial evaluation. All ten children were evaluated 31-60 days after the 60-Day Timeline. Seven (7) of the ten (10) children were determined eligible for special education and related services and are receiving special education and related services; three (3) of the children were found not eligible for special education and related services.

The reasons for the delays in completing all required assessments for the initial evaluations were attributed to the following:

- Oversight of personnel who submit the referral documents;
- Oversight of personnel who conduct autism assessments and psycho-educational assessments; and
- Limited OT services to conduct assessments.

To address the reasons for the delay attributed to autism and psycho-educational evaluations, Guam Part B has reviewed its standard operating procedures and tracking mechanisms with its personnel who submit referral documents and conduct evaluations. Weekly reports are generated by the Data Office and are sent to Program Leads to track the status of the completion of all evaluations. This practice has reduced the number of delays from last APR reporting period of 18 delays to 6 delays with personnel.

To address the program delays in the area of Occupational Therapy: GDOE currently does not have an Occupational Therapist. A small purchase for occupational therapy services has been initiated to provide services to children needing OT services, which is inclusive of conducting evaluations. As a result of the request for a small purchase contract, an on-island company is providing services, which includes completing the evaluations for students who have been referred for occupational therapy services. As of this reporting period, all ten (10) students have been evaluated in the area of Occupational Therapy, which is an improvement from last year's FFY 2016 APR which had seven pending children who needed assessments in occupational therapy.

With the continuation of the small purchase contract for OT, GDOE is optimistic about completing subsequent requests for OT evaluations.

Based on this data, Guam Part B did not meet the compliance target for Indicator 11 with its performance of **93.42%** (227/243) during the cumulative reporting period July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

Guam Part B will continue to monitor the completion of the evaluations and meetings, the submission of paperwork, and any reasons for delay through the use of tracking forms developed for this purpose. All other aggressive monitoring activities will continue.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- ☒ The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- ☐ The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- ☐ State monitoring
- ☒ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The procedure that describes the identification, referral, 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 parental consent for evaluation and completing the referral process. Guam DOE follows the IDEA 2004 regulation for the 60-day timeline requirement. Guam has determined that the definition of "receipt of parental consent" is the date when the IEPC or CRT receives the signed parental consent form; this "receipt of parental consent" is what initiates the 60-day timeline.

The signed parental consent, a referral form, and all other documents supporting the 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 evaluators of the areas specified on the referral. Guam defines

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

"evaluation completed" as all assessments completed and documented through written reports. Upon completion of the evaluation(s), an eligibility meeting is held.

Standard Operating Procedures were also developed to ensure the completion of the evaluations 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 areas, 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. The "Lead" or "Monitor" for Indicator 11 tracks the referrals and provides visual dialogues to all unit coordinators to inform them of the referrals that were submitted. This process ensures that all units are kept abreast of any referrals they may have missed or that may have not been submitted to them in a timely manner.

If a referral is not evaluated within the 60-day allotted time frame, the referral is placed in a "priority status" and is aggressively monitored until the assessment is completed. Reasons for the delay of evaluation are documented by evaluators and justification for the delay, or reasons for the delay, are submitted for documentation purposes. The visual dialogue (Excel Report) is used in conjunction with the monthly Indicator 11: 60-Day Timeline report that is generated monthly by the Division of Special Education Data Office and assists in the validation and verification of data that is submitted and entered into the database.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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	null	null	0

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016:

In FFY 2016, Indicator 11 performance was 93.49% (359/384). As described, there were 18 initial evaluations completed over the 60-day timeline and seven pending Occupational Therapy (OT) initial assessments. These individual non-compliances were part of the subsequent data review 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 2016 Indicator 11 noncompliance data.

During the April 2018 APR clarification period, Guam Part B reported that the seven pending OT initial assessments reported in FFY 2016 were completed.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected:

As described in the FFY 2016 APR, the three FFY 2013 findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remained in FFY 2017 for not being able to demonstrate correct implementation of the 60-day timeline requirement for subsequent data.

As of January 22, 2019, GDOE's Compliance Monitoring Office reported that the three findings of noncompliance transferred from the school to the Division of Special Education remains "not yet verified as corrected" because the Division is unable to demonstrate correct implementation of the Child Find compliance requirements for initial evaluations.

As described in the Data Section of this FFY 2017 Indicator 11, the noncompliance performance data for autism, psycho-educational, and occupational therapy (OT) initial evaluations were completed but over the 60-day timeline.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

As of January 22, 2019, all initial evaluations have been completed, with the exception of initial assessments for OT due to GDOE not having qualified personnel to conduct the initial assessment for OT.

To address the noncompliance related to initial assessment for OT, a small purchase for on-island OT services and a contract for on-line OT tele-practice services have been secured. The small purchase contract, an on-island company, provides minimal services, inclusive of completing the OT evaluations for students. The on-line OT tele-practice service system through an off-island vendor is scheduled to be implemented by the beginning of next school year. The off-island vendor will be on-site before the beginning of next school year to provide training to Division personnel on how OT services, including evaluations, will be conducted through tele-practice. Training will also be provided to e-helpers assigned to support the OT tele-practice service delivery. These e-helpers are the one-to-one aides, consulting resource teachers, or special education teachers responsible for supporting the students requiring OT services during the tele-practice service time.

April 2019 Update: As mentioned earlier, the seven OT initial evaluations from the FFY 2016 APR Indicator 11 data were completed. The Division has in place a small purchase for on-island OT services, which include OT evaluations, and a contract in place for OT tele-practice services beginning next school year. As of April 17, 2019, there was a total of seven new requests for OT initial evaluations; of which, two were completed but over timeline and five remain pending within the 60-day timeline.

OSEP Response

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within its jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

--

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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))

Historical Data											
Baseline Data: 2005											
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		90.00%	92.00%	98.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data	
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	69
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	10
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	47
d. Number of children 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.	12
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under 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

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. [c/(a-b-d-e-f)]x100	47	47	100%	100%	100%

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

- What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
- State monitoring
 - 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 continues to maintain 100% compliance for Indicator 12. For this reporting period, there were 69 preschoolers that were referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. 10 children were referred to Part B and were determined Not Eligible prior to their 3rd birthday; 47 were referred to Part B and were determined eligible and had their IEPs developed and in effect by their 3rd birthday.

Additionally, there were 12 children whose parents refused to provide consent and caused delays in the evaluation of initial services: eight (8) children had parents who refused services from Part B; one (1) child whereby the Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) terminated services because the child was displaying "age appropriate" behaviors and the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

child's parents expressed no concerns with their child's development; and three (3) children had families who relocated off-island.

There were also no (0) children to report in Measurement "E," the number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their 3rd birthday; and in Measurement "F," the number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday, as Guam does not have a policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar option. There are also no other children to report who have been served in Part B and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in B, C, D, E, or F.

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

Guam Part B receives an LEA notification which initiates a referral from Part C to Part B for children who may be in need of continued services from Part B. This LEA notification is submitted to Part B as early as 9 months before the child's 3rd birthday, and no later than 33 months of age. After participating in the child's Transition Conference, which is facilitated by Part C personnel, the Preschool IEPC is responsible for submitting the referral with the consent from the parent for an evaluation, and monitoring the timeframe 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 with the Part B Coordinator/School Program Consultant monthly to review each pending referral.

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

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

OSEP Response**Required Actions**

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						99.84%	99.83%	100%	99.64%	98.87%	91.06%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	91.32%	90.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
484	568	90.77%	100%	85.21%

Reasons for Slippage

Indicator 13 is a compliance Indicator that reports the percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

For reporting period July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018, there were a total of 568 youth aged 16 and above with an IEP. Of the 568 youth, **85.21%** (484/568) have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable them to meet their post-secondary goals. Based on this reported data, Guam Part B did not meet the 100% compliance for Indicator 13 during this reporting period.

Guam Part B attributes the following reasons for this slippage:

IEPS REASON FOR NON COMPLIANCE

18	IEPs for these students are not current, but the transition plans meet IND13 requirements
65	IEPs for these students are current, but the transition plans do not meet IND13 requirements
1	IEPs for these students are not current, and the transition plans do not meet IND 13 requirements
84	TOTAL

Drill-down activities were conducted to determine the “slippage” with the performance of each of the high schools. The table below reflects the results of the drill down activities:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

DESCRIPTION	HS #1	HS #2	HS #3	HS #4	HS #5	HS #6	TOTAL
Number of Students with IEPs aged 16 and above	131	105	54	114	92	72	568
Number of Students with IEPs Current and have Transition Plan Requirements Met	111	103	48	112	41	69	484
Number of Students with IEPs Not Current but Transition Plan Requirement Met	9	0	3	1	3	2	18
Number of Students with IEPs Current and Transition Plan Requirements Not Met	10	2	3	1	48	1	65
Number of Students with IEPs Not Current and Transition Plan Requirements Not Met	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total # of students with IEPs age 16 and above who have current IEPs and met requirements divided by Total # of students with IEPs age 16 and above	111/131	103/105	48/54	112/114	41/92	69/72	484/568
Percentage	84.73%	98.10%	88.88%	98.24%	44.57%	95.83%	85.21%

Upon review of this data with the schools, additional reasons for the delay has been attributed to new personnel assigned at the schools to do case management and develop transition plans for students with IEPs.

To address the slippage, targeted technical assistance is being provided to assist the schools in order to meet the requirements of this compliance Indicator. This targeted technical assistance has been on-going and will be more intensive through the following activities:

- Division of Special Education Transition Services personnel have been assigned to specific school sites to provide the on-going technical assistance and training on the IEP process and to provide guidance on the development of the transition plans of students with IEPs;
- School personnel (CRT or Transition Teachers & School Administrators) were provided a school report and an IEP/Re-Evaluation Calendar listing the IEPs and evaluations due by month, which outlined meetings that are due in chronological order. These school reports will be provided monthly, thereafter; and
- Monthly Indicator 13 reports will also be generated and provided to each school administrator, CRT and Transition Teacher in order to track the status of Indicator 13 for their students.

It must be noted that the Division is also working closely with the Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) after a random review of student folders was conducted. Based on that review, a more comprehensive and targeted technical assistance was given to each high school team, along with Division personnel from the Secondary Transition Office. This training and targeted technical assistance will assist the schools with providing quality data (valid and reliable) for reporting purposes and with ensuring the implementation of the transition plans developed.

In addition, the Division has accessed technical assistance from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to support Division and School personnel with meeting Indicator 13 requirements. In December 2018, a NTACT consultant conducted an on-site visit to meet with Division, School, and CMO personnel regarding

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

current and best practices related to the secondary transition requirements. Follow-up off-site and on-site consultation is anticipated this school year 2018-2019.

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



State monitoring



State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?



Yes



No

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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	null	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Correction of Findings in FFY 2016:

In FFY 2016, Guam Part B reported 90.77% (541/596) compliance with Indicator 13. These 55 individual noncompliance were the subsequent data reviewed for the 15 FFY 2015 findings not yet verified as corrected for secondary transition requirements. Therefore, a written notice of noncompliance findings was not issued for the 55 individual noncompliance reported in the FFY 2016 APR Indicator 13.

The 15 Secondary Transition findings of noncompliance issued in FFY 2015 were verified as corrected beyond the one year timeline. The Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO), issued a written notice of correction of noncompliance on September 13, 2018 to the one high school. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, CMO reviewed subsequent data to verify that the one high school was implementing the secondary transition requirements correctly.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The Division of Special Education maintains a data system for IDEA procedural requirements, including the secondary transition requirements. Data input is based on the data sheet and actual IEP documents submitted to the Division. The Division generates a monthly report by schools for the secondary transition requirements for review by the Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO). CMO utilizes the monthly report to identify noncompliance and to monitor

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

subsequent data for compliance. Verification of correction for each individual case of noncompliance is monitored by CMO through the monthly report reviews. CMO also utilizes random file reviews of the actual IEP documents filed at the Division of Special Education to identify noncompliance and to monitor subsequent data for compliance.

As described earlier, the one high school that remained pending verified correction for its FFY 2015 findings of noncompliance received its written notice of correction of noncompliance on September 13, 2018. This included verified correction of the 55 individual noncompliance instances reported in the FFY 2016 APR Indicator 13 performance. Reported as subsequent data, the CMO, through school monthly reports, verified that the 55 individual noncompliance instances in the FFY 2016 APR Indicator 13 performance were either corrected or no longer in GDOE's jurisdiction. Of the 55, 44 were students who left GDOE's jurisdiction and 11 remained in school. The 11 who remained in school had an IEP that included the secondary transition requirements. It should be noted that 21 of the 44 students who left GDOE's jurisdiction graduated with a high school diploma and had an IEP prior to graduating that included the secondary transition requirements.

OSEP Response

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within its jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 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 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

--

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

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))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							12.00%	13.00%	13.00%	16.18%	17.00%
		Data						11.00%	8.00%	8.00%	35.00%	16.18%	15.25%
B	2009	Target ≥							52.00%	53.00%	53.00%	58.82%	60.00%
		Data						51.00%	27.00%	54.00%	65.00%	58.82%	59.32%
C	2009	Target ≥							61.00%	62.00%	62.00%	66.00%	67.00%
		Data						60.00%	42.00%	56.00%	71.00%	66.18%	71.19%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	18.00%	19.00%
	Data	16.30%	4.60%
B	Target ≥	61.00%	62.00%
	Data	61.96%	49.43%
C	Target ≥	68.00%	69.00%
	Data	69.57%	55.17%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	20.00%	21.00%
Target B ≥	63.00%	64.00%
Target C ≥	70.00%	71.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	69.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	16.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	30.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	1.00
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).	0.00

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	16.00	69.00	4.60%	20.00%	23.19%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	46.00	69.00	49.43%	63.00%	66.67%
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)	47.00	69.00	55.17%	70.00%	68.12%

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.
- ☐
Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was sampling used? ☐ No

Was a survey used? ☐ Yes
Is it a new or revised survey? ☐ No

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.

Please refer to the attached PDF document "FFY 2017 Guam Part B IND14" for a description of the response data and determination of representation of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Guam Part B reports for this FFY 2017 APR that the response data is not representative of the demographics of the youth who are no longer longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? ☐ No
Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Please refer to the attached PDF document "FFY 2017 Guam Part B IND14" for a description of the response data and determination of representation of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Guam Part B reports for this FFY 2017 APR that the response data is not representative of the demographics of the youth who are no longer longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 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 the State is taking to address this issue. The State 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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

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)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data		100%	50.00%	100%		0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data	100%	85.71%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2	2	85.71%		100%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Data Table for Dispute Resolutions for reporting year 2017-2018, two (2) requests for due process hearing complaints were filed during FFY 2017. Resolution sessions were held for two (2) as required by procedures.

Additionally, per OSEP 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.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2017. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

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)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				100%							
Data		100%	100%	100%							

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data		100%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	1	100%		0%

☒ Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As reported in the Guam Part B 618 Dispute Resolutions Survey for reporting year 2017-2018, there was one request for mediation filed during this reporting period. This request for mediation held was not related to a due process complaint.

Additionally, as 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 required to develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and to report on them in the corresponding APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

Guam did not submit data that was consistent with its IDEA section 618 reporting for FFY 2016. Guam must provide data for FFY 2017 that is consistent with its IDEA section 618 reporting in its FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response

Guam reported in the FFY 2016 APR that it would resubmit the Dispute Resolutions table during the "reopen period." Guam has since then refiled its Dispute Resolutions table, which is consistent with its FFY 2016 APR data for Indicator 16.

For FFY 2017, Guam Part B submitted its Dispute Resolution data timely, accurately, and completely as reported in the Data Quality Report for this reporting period. This data is consistent with its IDEA section 618 reporting in this FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2017. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		0%	0%	0%	4.00%
Data	0%	0%	7.00%	5.00%	10.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	8.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

Guam Part B will be measuring the proficiency in Reading for its students with disabilities in the 3rd grade in four participating schools through their performance on the district-wide (state-wide) assessment.

Please refer to the description provided in Guam Part B's Component 3: State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

☐ Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Please refer to the attached document FFY 2017 Guam Part B SPP/APR Indicator 17 - State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 3 under the Introduction section for the Overview.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Please see the attached document describing Guam Part B's Component 1: Data Analysis.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see the attached document describing Guam Part B's Component 2: Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Guam Part B State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for children with disabilities: 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.

Description

Please see the attached document describing Guam Part B's Component 3: State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please see the attached document describing Guam Part B's Component 4: Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

☒ Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Please see the attached document describing Guam Part B's Component 5: Theory of Action

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please see the attached FFY 2014 Guam Part B Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan, Phase II, inclusive of Component 1: Infrastructure Development; Component 2: Support for Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs); and Component 3: Evaluation, along with the four Appendices.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please see the attached FFY 2014 Guam Part B Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan, Phase II, inclusive of Component 1: Infrastructure Development; Component 2: Support for Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs); and Component 3: Evaluation, along with the four Appendices.

Evaluation

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please see the attached FFY 2014 Guam Part B Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan, Phase II, inclusive of Component 1: Infrastructure Development; Component 2: Support for Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs); and Component 3: Evaluation, along with the four Appendices.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Phase II Technical Assistance and Support:

The development of Phase I and Phase II of Guam's SSIP was made possible due to the expert technical assistance from the University of Guam CEDDERS, the OSEP-funded National Technical Assistance Centers, (IDC, DaSy, ECTA Center, WestEd NCSI), participation in the Language & Literacy Cross-Entity Learning Collaborative meetings and the Pacific Entity Collaborative meetings. Guam accessed and benefitted from numerous resources available on TA center websites, face-to-face meetings, conference calls and facilitated work sessions. In addition, Guam also received assistance with the evaluation component in Phase II of the SSIP from Sigma Associates, Incorporated (SAI), a woman-owned evaluation and research company.

During the implementation of Phase II activities, Guam will continue to access and request TA in the areas needed to ensure the improvement activities are effective and will lead to achieving the SIMR. Technical Assistance is currently being provided to IEP teams of the participating schools on IEP assessments, present levels of performance, specially-designed instruction, and intensive interventions. Guam is also in the process of securing PD and TA specific to the essential components of and reading.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please refer to the attached file, FFY 2017 Guam Part B SPP/APR Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for a description of the Summary of Phase III Year 3 for this reporting period.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please refer to the attached file, FFY 2017 Guam Part B SPP/APR Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for a description of the Summary of Phase III Year 3 for this reporting period.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SIMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please refer to the attached file, FFY 2017 Guam Part B SPP/APR Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for a description of the Summary of Phase III Year 3 for this reporting period.

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please refer to the attached file, FFY 2017 Guam Part B SPP/APR Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for a description of the Summary of Phase III Year 3 for this reporting period.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SIMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Please refer to the attached file, FFY 2017 Guam Part B SPP/APR Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for a description of the the Summary of Phase III Year 3 for this reporting period.

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please refer to the attached file, FFY 2017 Guam Part B SPP/APR Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), for a description of the the Summary of Phase III Year 3 for this reporting period.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Yolanda Gabriel

Title: Assistant Superintendent

Email: ysgabriel@gdoe.net

Phone: 671-300-1322