



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 18, 2024

Honorable Kenneth Swanson
Superintendent
Guam Department of Education
501 Mariner Avenue
Barrigada, GU 96913

Dear Superintendent Swanson:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Guam needs assistance in meeting the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Guam's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Guam's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in Guam's "2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for Guam and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix (including Components and Appendices) that include scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) Guam's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Sections 616\(d\) and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part C](#)" (HTDMD-C).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making the Department's determinations in 2024, as it did for Part C determinations in 2015-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD-C document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Guam.) For 2024, the Department's IDEA Part C determinations continue to include consideration of each State's Child Outcomes data, which measure how children who receive Part C services are improving functioning in three outcome areas that are critical to school readiness:

- positive social-emotional skills;
- acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Specifically, the Department considered the data quality and the child performance levels in each State's Child Outcomes FFY 2022 data.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Guam's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your State-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Guam's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in Indicators 1 through 11, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Guam is required to take. The actions that Guam is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for your State to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Guam's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part C," which shows how OSEP calculated the State's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Guam's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's last three IDEA Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON, DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness
by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*

Guam's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §303.704(a), if a State is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State address the areas in which the State needs assistance and require the State to work with appropriate entities; and/or
- (2) identify the State as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's IDEA Part C grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\) | OSEP Ideas That Work, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Guam to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Guam should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. We strongly encourage Guam to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which Guam received a score of zero. Guam must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Sections 616(e)(7) and 642 and 34 C.F.R. §303.706, Guam must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement action, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering two additional criteria related to IDEA Part C determinations. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State that would otherwise receive a score of meets requirements would not be able to receive a determination of meets requirements if the State had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is reviewing whether and how to consider IDEA Part C results data reported under three indicators in order to improve results for all infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities. This review would include considering alternative scoring options for child outcome Indicator C-3 and considering as potential additional factors the information and data that States report under child find Indicators C-5 and C-6.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part C Results Matrix and States will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data that States submit will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part C SPP/APR Indicators 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part C data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the appropriate EDFacts system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part C data.

As a reminder, Guam must report annually to the public, by posting on the State lead agency's website, on the performance of each early intervention service (EIS) program located in Guam on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Guam's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Guam must:

- (1) review EIS program performance against targets in Guam's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each EIS program "meets the requirements" of Part C, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part C of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each EIS program of its determination.

Further, Guam must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the State lead agency's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Guam's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Guam's efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and looks forward to working with Guam

over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,



Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Part C Coordinator

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Guam



**PART C DUE
February 1, 2024**

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

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of Guam's Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2022. A description of the 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 APR to the public are provided separately within this introduction section of Guam's FFY2022 SPP/APR.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

General Supervision System

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

The Guam Department of Education (GDOE) is a unitary system. The Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) is part of GDOE's Division of Special Education.

The Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO), directly under the Superintendent of Education, is responsible for implementing Guam's General Supervision System. GDOE has created effective monitoring strategies that are integrated across all components of the general supervision system. Multiple data sources and methods are used to monitor the public schools and GEIS. Selected monitoring activities ensure continuous examination of performance for compliance and results. This includes off-site and on-site monitoring activities. Data from the monitoring activities are used to collect and/or verify performance data for every indicator included in the State Performance Plan (SPP). This analysis process ensures that the monitoring system is designed to maximize the use of monitoring resources to include effective professional development and targeted technical assistance. Overall, the general supervision system includes planned analysis and review of all available monitoring data from on-site, off-site monitoring activities, and dispute resolution. This review process is conducted biannually.

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). The CMO would examine dispute resolution data from GEIS to identify issues related to performance and help plan onsite monitoring activities. The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

DOE has a technical assistance system with mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance, and support to early interventionists and other early childhood service providers. Technical assistance (TA), training and support are provided based on program needs in improving services for low-incidence areas, improving child outcomes, coaching for families, and any other areas identified through a needs assessment or through the SPP/APR.

The technical assistance, training, and support were based on program needs identified in improving timely services, child and family outcomes, and transition planning. GEIS was able to access resources through OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources such as DaSY Center, IDEA Data Center, Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), and through the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (CEDDERS).

During this reporting period, GEIS continued to receive TA support from CEDDERS and from the Guam Department of Public Health and Social Services: Preschool Development Grant (birth-Five) on the Learn the Signs, Act Early (LTSAE): 4-Key Steps for Early Identification, Ages and Stages Questionnaire Developmental Screening, and Teaching Strategies: Training for Infants, Toddlers, and Twos. Other collaborative TA and professional development was provided through partnership with the GDOE on the Social & Emotional Learning: Conscious Discipline Training, the ADOS-2 virtual and on-site training sessions

GEIS has mechanisms in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the technical assistance, training, and supports provided. One strategy that the Program is using to measure the impact of the training are self-assessment surveys that are disseminated before and after the training to determine the levels of understanding and competencies of the providers. In addition, there are follow-up observations to see if there are changes in the implementation of evidence-based practices. The Program uses other methods of evaluation such as, the review of data compiled from the training evaluations, observations, and feedback from parents, service providers, GELC, and the Part C Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC) members. These mechanisms are placed to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to the GEIS program.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Guam Part C has in place mechanisms to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

As part of GDOE's State Strategic Plan, 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 normally a total of 9 professional development days in the GDOE School Calendar. The nine (9) professional development days are designated specifically to focus on the state-wide initiatives. Since the GEIS is a part of the GDOE Division of Special Education, as much as possible, the designated professional development days are utilized to assist the early intervention service providers to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers

and their families. GEIS may utilize these days to continue with direct services. This is to ensure that services are not compromised, when participating in other training activities offered by other early childhood serving agencies. GEIS assures professional development days are provided and services not compromise should schedules are made to the GDOE School Calendar due the year.

GEIS reports on a quarterly basis to the Guam's Early Learning Council (GELC) which represents all early childhood serving agencies. GEIS continues to partner and collaborate with all early childhood serving agencies in planning for professional development activities. The Department of Public Health and Social Services – Division of Children's Wellness (DPHSS-DCW) Preschool Development Grant (PDG) Birth to Five project continues to be an excellent collaborative initiative in supporting shared professional development activities. These professional development training activities include – a) Teaching Strategies to include the Creative Curriculum: Training for Infants, Toddlers, and Twos, and the ReadyRosie family engagement resource; b) Strengthening Families/Protective Factors Framework- Parent Café; c) Learn The Signs: 4 Key Steps for Early Identification, and (d) other GELC early childhood initiatives. Other collaborative TA and professional development was provided through partnership with the GDOE on the Conscious Discipline training and with the Guam Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) Project in training and webinars on supporting families of children who are deaf or hard of hearing, and through partnership with the GDOE on the Social & Emotional Learning: Conscious Discipline Training, the ADOS-2 virtual and on-site training sessions.

GEIS continues to receive training and support through technical assistance from the CEDDERS to build confidence and competencies of the service providers and to ensure evidence-based strategies or models are implemented with fidelity. These models include: 1) Routines Based Intervention, 2) Early Childhood Coaching and have expanded the strategies by using the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) Family Coaching and the ESDM Help Is In Your Hands Parent modules, and 3) Infusing and using Child and Family Outcomes throughout the IFSP process. GEIS continues to monitor and evaluate these strategies through the implementation of the Early Childhood Coaching (FLARE) plans during home visiting sessions, direct observations, and assessments of the coaching practices using the Guam Early Childhood Coaching Fidelity Checklists.

In addition, GEIS continues to facilitate the Family Learning Sessions on evidence-based strategies at support a child's expressive language skills. The focus of these learning sessions is to provide opportunities for parents to apply these strategies and share their learning with other families. In addition, service providers share the additional tools and resources when working with infants and toddlers and their families during regular scheduled home visiting sessions.

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS, The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

Apply stakeholder input from introduction to all Part C results indicators. (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

44

Parent Members Engagement:

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

At each input sessions, infographics were used to provide a visual depiction of each indicator as a mechanism for increasing greater understanding of each indicator, and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Review performance for each indicator, 2) if there was a slippage in the performance, stakeholders provided input on the improvement activities, 3) provided suggestions and recommendations on how we could "Make things better" and to improve the outcomes. Stakeholders who attended the virtual sessions and the in-person session included parents, service providers, members of the GICC, the Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) members, community partners, and the GEIS SSIP Core Leadership team. At each session, Stakeholders were acknowledged for their presence and participation at the meeting and that their input on the improvement activities will target improved outcomes for children and their families.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is a very technical report and may be difficult to understand. To engage its stakeholders in meaningful discussions surrounding the SPP/APR, Part C employed the following activities to ensure input is received from its parents and families, personnel, partner agencies, and interagency coordinating council members to support the development of implementation activities designed to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents in support of improving outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families:

- SPP Indicators were grouped in related clusters so stakeholders could review smaller pieces of information instead of the entire report at one time. The Parent Café model was utilized when breaking the groups into clusters;
- SPP/APR Infographics were developed so stakeholders could better understand how early childhood outcomes data are compiled and used for services to infants and toddlers and their families, including infographics for each of the Part C Indicators;
- Stakeholder sessions were conducted both in-person and virtually, along with hybrid presentations so parents and families could actively engage in discussions surrounding the strategies implemented for each of the Part C Indicators;
- Stakeholders were provided with materials in the form of handouts and PowerPoints so they could follow along in the discussions;

- Part C employed the premise of "Leading by Convening" to ensure all stakeholders are "at the table" to promote meaningful engagement;
- Family Learning Sessions were conducted virtually and in-person in community settings, such as the library, to assist families in understanding how their children grow and develop, specifically providing strategies and supports in improving expressive language and communication (SPP Indicator 11: SSIP SIMR);
- Participation in the Village Play Time events, in collaboration with other early childhood programs, promoted child find activities to boost the number of infants and toddlers and their families served by Part C. These events were held in various villages, representing northern, central, and southern regions of the island, to reach underserved populations; and
- Participation in Community Fair events, in collaboration with other early childhood programs, such as the Check-Me-Out Fair (Child Find) and the Early Learning Convenings. These events were held in the community, such as the shopping mall, to promote Child Find and awareness of early childhood programs, inclusive of Part C.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Prior to the Stakeholder input sessions, the flyers entitled: Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was shared during a quarterly meeting for the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council, and the Guam Early Learning Council. The flyer was also shared during the GEIC Leadership Committee meetings for the Preschool Development Grant on activities. The flyer was also shared with parents enrolled in GEIS during visits and through emails, text, and phone calls.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

GEIS will include the SPP/APR 2022-2023 report on the GEIS website: <https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/3-Guam-Early-Intervention-Services> (click on grants and reports on left side), and <http://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education>

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

GEIS will report annually to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the submission of the FFY 2022 SPP/ APR.

GEIS will also post a generated SPP/APR pdf version for public posting and OSEP's Determination Letter and Response Table on the DOE website at Guam Early Intervention System website.

In addition, GEIS has included the APR and SSIP Reports on the GEIS website: <https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/3-Guam-Early-Intervention-Services> (click on grants and reports on left side), and <http://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA Section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. § 303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support Guam's submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with Guam's SPP/APR documents.

Guam's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 21, 2023 determination letter informed Guam that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance. Guam provided the required information.

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

Intro - Required Actions

Guam's IDEA Part C determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In Guam's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	98.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.68%	96.00%	96.83%	96.43%	98.50%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
101	121	98.50%	100%	91.74%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Ten (10) children who did not receive timely services resulting in program delays. Nine of the ten children did not receive timely speech services due to no speech services available during this period. Three of the ten children did not receive timely occupational therapy due to a therapist not available. One of the ten children did not receive timely vision services, and one of the ten children did not receive timely OT services which was due to the shutdown of the school system and resulting in the closure for the remainder of the school due to the Typhoon Marwar, GEIS lost their Speech Therapists in September 2022 and began efforts to seek services locally and off-island. Part B, but was not able to support due to the shortages they were also dealing with. By March 2023, GEIS was able to secure services speech services from a local speech pathologist. We were able to also secure service from an off-island vendor for Speech and OT via telehealth.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

10

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

There were ten (10) delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances. Of the ten, five (5) were due to Typhoon Marwar in May 2023, (3) were due to parents cancelled visits for a later date, (1) parent requested to hold services, and (1) was no response to call or written notice from the service coordinator .

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

GEIS' definition of "receipt of timely services" is determined by services on the IFSP provided within 30 days from the date of consent signed by the parent. Though services reported are to be delivered within 30 days of consent, IFSP services are initiated as soon as possible, depending on family circumstances. On the day that service is provided, the service provider has the family sign the form confirming delivery of initial services. The service provider submits documentation to the SC who then submits documentation to the data clerk for input on the date service was delivered. Should service not be delivered in a timely manner, the Service Coordinator is required to submit documentation stating the reason(s) for delay. Monthly meetings are scheduled and conducted individually with staff to discuss the status of cases.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Guam Part C data for Indicator 1 was collected from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The actual data for 2022-2023, were compiled through the GEIS data system and a manual review of the service provider's contact logs and intervention plans found in the child's program folder. A data system report indicates new services recommended in the child's IFSP, date service is to begin (within 30 days from consent by parent of IFSP), and date service was delivered by service provider. The data report also indicates a 'flag' on new services that were not delivered within the required timeline. The SC is responsible for submitting required documentation indicating the date service was provided to the data office. The SC is also responsible for submitting documentation of service not delivered by the required timeline. Of the 121 infants and toddlers, there were a total of (101) children who received timely services, (10) were delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances, and (10) were due to program delays.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During this reporting period, the program lost their Speech Pathologist, but were able to secure staff by March 2023. The program also secured occupational therapy services from an on-line vendor, but a delay was caused by pending licensure, from the Guam Board of Allied Health Examiners, authorizing the therapists to practice on Guam. For the child who did not receive vision services timely during the week Typhoon Marwar had hit the island: the service provider did not provide the service due to the shut down of the school system, and the school did open for the remainder of the school year. These children exited the program to Part B a month and a half after the initial IFSP. The program also lost a teacher in August (left island) and is still unable to replace her at this time.

GEIS performance for this reporting period is 101/121 or 91.74%.

During the Stakeholder Input sessions, the following were recommendations to include in the improvement activities:

- 1) Review the service coordination program procedures to ensure reason for delays are documented clearly and consistently and develop a process to strengthen communication with families, 2) Look at the child's outcomes and see how the team can maximize efforts to support these outcomes, 3) Review how the program shares information on Payor of last resort, how families are guided and improve verbiage shared with parents to help them understand the process better, 4) Review recruitment strategies to bring in more related service providers, 5) Public awareness campaign to bring in more support personnel and services,

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9		0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) is responsible for monitoring and verifying correct implementation of Indicator 1 regulatory requirements. CMO reviews the Guam Early Intervention Services (GEIS), the Part C program, Indicator 1 program data reports to verify that the source of the noncompliance is correctly implementing Indicator 1 regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. On a quarterly basis, CMO reviews Indicator 1 program data reports for updated/subsequent data at 100% compliance to determine whether GEIS is correctly implementing Indicator 1 regulatory requirements.

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

CMO verifies each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected through a review of GEIS Indicator 1 program data reports.

In FFY 2021, CMO conducted off-site monitoring for Indicator 1 compliance. The off-site monitoring included a review of Indicator 1 program data report for the period of July 1, 2021– March 8, 2022. In March 2022, a Written Notice of Finding of Noncompliance for Indicator 1 was issued to GEIS. The Notice identified nine individual cases of noncompliance based on the Indicator 1 program data report. The Notice listed the nine individual cases and indicated that the timeline for when the early intervention services were provided was not documented.

CMO's quarterly review of Indicator 1 program data report included verification of the dates when the early intervention services were provided for the nine individual cases of noncompliance. The Indicator 1 program data report showed two of the nine individual cases of noncompliance were untimely due to exceptional family circumstances and the remaining seven individual cases of noncompliance were provided the early intervention services timely. The two exceptional family circumstances were included in the FFY 2021 Indicator 1 performance data. CMO's verification of correction of the nine individual cases raised concerns regarding the program data reports not reflecting accurate timelines. GEIS reported the process for inputting data into the system in a timely manner has been a challenge.

Within one-year from March 2022, CMO issued to GEIS the Verified Timely Correction Notice for the noncompliance identified, which included verified correction of the individual cases of noncompliance (two were verified to be due to exceptional family circumstances and seven were actually provided timely). In addition, the notice included GEIS demonstrating 100% compliance of updated/subsequent data, which served as evidence of GEIS correctly implementing Indicator 1 regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

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

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator and is: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a 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 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Refer to Indicator 1 Data section for a description of the FFY 2021 written notice of findings of noncompliance and verified timely correction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

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

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target>=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.36%	98.00%
Data	100.00%	99.30%	99.36%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	131
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	131

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
131	131	100.00%	98.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Of the 131 children and families receiving services in natural environments, 127 received services in the home, and 4 received their services in other community settings.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling of **infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

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

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

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

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

YES

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?

At-risk infants and toddlers

Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2020	Target>=	68.00%	70.00%	66.00%	36.17%	40.59%
A1	36.17%	Data	47.92%	56.86%	60.38%	36.17%	55.26%
A1 AR		Target>=	68.00%	70.00%			
A1 AR		Data	100.00%	100.00%			100.00%
A2	2020	Target>=	74.00%	76.00%	66.30%	45.59%	50.25%
A2	45.59%	Data	55.17%	56.10%	55.84%	45.59%	39.58%
A2 AR		Target>=	74.00%	76.00%			
A2 AR		Data	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%
B1	2020	Target>=	73.00%	75.00%	65.50%	46.30%	49.90%
B1	46.30%	Data	45.76%	58.18%	60.34%	46.30%	60.00%
B1 AR		Target>=	73.00%	75.00%			
B1 AR		Data	100.00%	100.00%		0.00%	100.00%
B2	2020	Target>=	62.00%	64.00%	54.00%	39.71%	43.22%
B2	39.71%	Data	44.83%	48.78%	42.86%	39.71%	33.33%
B2 AR	2006	Target>=	62.00%	64.00%			
B2 AR		Data	100.00%	100.00%		87.50%	100.00%
C1	2020	Target>=	68.00%	70.00%	59.00%	46.00%	48.52%
C1	46.00%	Data	36.17%	50.00%	55.17%	46.00%	55.26%
C1 AR	2006	Target>=	68.00%	70.00%			
C1 AR		Data	100.00%	100.00%		0.00%	100.00%
C2	2020	Target>=	68.00%	70.00%	61.00%	47.06%	50.26%
C2	47.06%	Data	54.02%	50.00%	55.84%	47.06%	43.75%
C2 AR	2006	Target>=	68.00%	70.00%			
C2 AR		Data	100.00%	100.00%		87.50%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------

Target A1 >=	45.01%	49.43%	53.85%	58.28%
A1 AR				
Target A2 >=	54.32%	58.29%	62.26%	66.50%
A2 AR				
Target B1 >=	53.50%	57.10%	60.70%	64.50%
B1 AR				
Target B2 >=	45.86%	48.50%	51.14%	53.78%
B2 AR				
Target C1 >=	51.04%	53.56%	56.08%	58.62%
C1 AR				
Target C2 >=	52.69%	55.12%	57.55%	60.00%
C2 AR				

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	24	36.36%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	14	21.21%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	12	18.18%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	16	24.24%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	13	100.00%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	26	50	55.26%	45.01%	52.00%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they	28	66	39.58%	54.32%	42.42%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
turned 3 years of age or exited the program							

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	0	0	100.00%			N/A	N/A
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	13	13	100.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	30	45.45%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	15	22.73%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	12	18.18%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	9	13.64%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	7.69%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2	15.38%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	76.92%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	27	57	60.00%	53.50%	47.37%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B	21	66	33.33%	45.86%	31.82%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

The percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who substantially increased who were functioning within age expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

For this reporting period there were 57 of the 66 infants and toddlers that exited and participated in the outcome measure for Summary Statement 1. There were 27 out of the 57 or 47.47% who substantially increased their rate of growth in the area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. This is slippage of 12.63% as compared to FFY 2021 at 60%.

Stakeholders recommended that the following drill down data be reviewed to determine possible reasons for slippage: age at entry, service time, and disability, for children in category "c". As indicated in the reporting, category "b" are children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers by the time they exited the program. There were 30 out of the 66 or 45.5% of children who exited in category "b".

Age at Entry: Of the 30 children, there were 6 children that were less than 11 months old, 10 children were between 12 months and 23 months of age and 14 between 24 and 36 months of age.

Service Time: Eighteen (18) children received less than 11 months of early intervention services, 7 received 12 to 24 months of services, and 5 received 23 to 36 months of service.

Disability: Five (5) had established conditions, one with biological risk factors, and 24 were eligible as developmental delay.

Stakeholders discussed that the average age children enrolled into early intervention is at 18 months of age and received an average of 14.4 months of early intervention services. Overall, the data indicates that children are not accessing services in the first year of life. For this reporting period, about half of the staff have been with GEIS for less than 2 years and therefore, professional development continues to be a priority to ensure that providers have adequate to advanced level of confidence and understanding of the evidence-based practices that are used to support the child and family. Stakeholders discussed and agreed to the following improvement strategies:

Frequency: Stakeholders discussed the number of monthly services provided to families and encouraged the team to relook at family needs and increase services if families need more support.

Provider's Competencies: Stakeholders felt the importance of providing training for the new staff and booster sessions on early childhood coaching, routines-based interview, and embedment of child outcomes into the IFSP process.

Parent Competencies: Stakeholders believed the importance to determine parent knowledge and comfort levels when discussing the use and implementation of strategies. The focus of training is to provide parents with applied practice in using tips and ideas to support their child's expressive language and overall development within their daily routine.

Resources: Stakeholders shared that more online resources would provide families with the support needed while waiting for the next visit with their service provider. This will include, for example, online Parenting Curriculum (Birth-8 years) training that provides short videos sent to families through weekly emails like the Teaching Strategies Ready Rosie that was implemented Fall 2023.

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

For this reporting period there were 66 infants and toddlers that exited and participated in the outcome measure. Twenty-one (21) out of the 66 or 31.82% who reached or maintained age expected skills in the area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. This is a slippage of 1.51% as compared to FFY 2021 at 33.33%.

Stakeholders recommended that the following drill down data be reviewed to determine possible reasons for slippage: age at entry, service time, disability, and a comparison of frequency of services indicated in the IFSP and the actual number of services received for children for children in category "c". As indicated in the reporting, category "c" are children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach age expected skills by the time they exited the program. There were 15 out of the 67 or 22.7% of children who exited in category "c".

Age at Entry: Of the 15 children, there were 12 between 12 months and 23 months of age and 3 between 24 and 36 months of age.

Service Time: Five children received less than 11 months of early intervention services, and 10 received 12 to 23 months of services.

Disability: Two (2) had established conditions and 13 were eligible for developmental delay.

Stakeholders discussed that the average age children enrolled into early intervention is at 18 months of age and received an average of 14.4 months of early intervention services. Overall, the data indicates that children are not accessing services in the first year of life. For this reporting period, about half of the staff have been with GEIS for less than 2 years and therefore, professional development continues to be a priority to ensure that providers have adequate to advanced level of confidence and understanding of the evidence-based practices that are used to support the child and family. Stakeholders discussed and agreed to the following improvement strategies:

Frequency: Stakeholders discussed the number of monthly services provided to families and encouraged the team to relook at family needs and increase services if families need more support.

Provider's Competencies: Stakeholders felt the importance of providing training for the new staff and booster sessions on early childhood coaching, routines-based interview, and embedment of child outcomes into the IFSP process.

Parent Competencies: Stakeholders believed the importance to determine parent knowledge and comfort levels when discussing the use and implementation of strategies. The focus of training is to provide parents with applied practice in using tips and ideas to support their child's expressive language and overall development within their daily routine.

Resources: Stakeholders shared that more online resources would provide families with the support needed while waiting for the next visit with their service provider. This will include, for example, online Parenting Curriculum (Birth-8 years) training that provides short videos sent to families through weekly emails like the Teaching Strategies Ready Rosie that was implemented Fall 2023.

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	2	3	100.00%		66.67%	N/A	N/A
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	12	13	100.00%		92.31%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	29	43.94%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	17	25.76%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	12	18.18%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	12.12%

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	0	0.00%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	7.69%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	12	92.31%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	29	58	55.26%	51.04%	50.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	20	66	43.75%	52.69%	30.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

The percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who substantially increased who were functioning within age expectations in use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. For this reporting period there were 57 out of 66 infants and toddlers that exited and participated in the outcome measure for Summary Statement 1.

There were 29 out of the 57 or 50% who substantially increased their rate of growth in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. This is slippage of 5.26% as compared to FFY 2021 at 55.26%.

Stakeholders recommended that the following drill down data be reviewed to determine possible reasons for slippage: age at entry, service time, and disability, for children in category "c". As indicated in the reporting, category "b" are children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers by the time they exited the program. There were 29 out of the 66 or 43.9% of children who exited in category "b".

Age at Entry: Of the 29 children, there were 8 children that were less than 11 months old, 9 children were between 12 months and 23 months of age and 12 between 24 and 36 months of age.

Service Time: Sixteen (16) children received less than 11 months of early intervention services, 6 received 12 to 23 months of services, and 7 received 23 to 36 months of service.

Disability: Seven (7) had established conditions, one with biological risk factors, and 21 were eligible as developmental delay.

Stakeholders discussed that the average age children enrolled into early intervention is at 18 months of age and received an average of 14.4 months of early intervention services. Overall, the data indicates that children are not accessing services in the first year of life. For this reporting period, about half of the staff have been with GEIS for less than 2 years and therefore, professional development continues to be a priority to ensure that providers have adequate to advanced level of confidence and understanding of the evidence-based practices that are used to support the child and family. Stakeholders discussed and agreed to the following improvement strategies:

Frequency: Stakeholders discussed the number of monthly services provided to families and encouraged the team to relook at family needs and increase services if families need more support.

Provider's Competencies: Stakeholders felt the importance of providing training for the new staff and booster sessions on early childhood coaching, routines-based interview, and embedment of child outcomes into the IFSP process.

Parent Competencies: Stakeholders believed the importance to determine parent knowledge and comfort levels when discussing the use and implementation of strategies. The focus of training is to provide parents with applied practice in using tips and ideas to support their child's expressive language and overall development within their daily routine.

Resources: Stakeholders shared that more online resources would provide families with the support needed while waiting for the next visit with their service provider. This will include, for example, online Parenting Curriculum (Birth-8 years) training that provides short videos sent to families through weekly emails like the Teaching Strategies Ready Rosie that was implemented Fall 2023.

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

For this reporting period there were 66 infants and toddlers that exited and participated in the outcome measure. Twenty (20) out of the 60 or 30.30% who reached or maintained age expected skills in the area of the use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. This is a slippage of 13.45% as compared to FFY 2021 at 43.75%.

Stakeholders recommended that the following drill down data be reviewed to determine possible reasons for slippage: age at entry, service time, disability, and a comparison of frequency of services indicated in the IFSP and the actual number of services received for children for children in category "c". As indicated in the reporting, category "c" are children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach age expected skills by the time they exited the program. There were 17 out of the 66 or 25.8% of children who exited in category "c".

Age at Entry: Of the 17 children, there were 13 between 12 months and 23 months of age and 4 between 24 and 36 months of age.

Service Time: Six children received less than 11 months of early intervention services, and 11 received 12 to 23 months of services.

Disability: Two had established conditions and 15 were eligible as developmental delay.

Stakeholders discussed that the average age children enrolled into early intervention is at 18 months of age and received an average of 14.4 months of early intervention services. Overall, the data indicates that children are not accessing services in the first year of life. For this reporting period, about half of the staff have been with GEIS for less than 2 years and therefore, professional development continues to be a priority to ensure that providers have adequate to advanced level of confidence and understanding of the evidence-based practices that are used to support the child and family. Stakeholders discussed and agreed to the following improvement strategies:

Frequency: Stakeholders discussed the number of monthly services provided to families and encouraged the team to relook at family needs and increase services if families need more support.

Provider's Competencies: Stakeholders felt the importance of providing training for the new staff and booster sessions on early childhood coaching, routines-based interview, and embedment of child outcomes into the IFSP process.

Parent Competencies: Stakeholders believed the importance to determine parent knowledge and comfort levels when discussing the use and implementation of strategies. The focus of training is to provide parents with applied practice in using tips and ideas to support their child's expressive language and overall development within their daily routine.

Resources: Stakeholders shared that more online resources would provide families with the support needed while waiting for the next visit with their service provider. This will include, for example, online Parenting Curriculum (Birth-8 years) training that provides short videos sent to families through weekly emails like the Teaching Strategies Ready Rosie that was implemented Fall 2023.

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1	1	100.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	13	13	100.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting 618 data	128
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	55
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	66

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

The Guam Early Intervention System uses multiple sources of information to determine the status of the early childhood outcomes. Most of the information is collected as part of the development of the child's IFSP; therefore, collecting child assessment information is part of the IFSP 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 in his or her natural environment. Information from the family and service providers in contact with the child is considered in deciding the rating for each outcome.

Various 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 or observation; Service Provider input/observation; Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP); the Guam Early Learning Guidelines; the Developmental Assessment of Young Children – 2nd Edition (DAYC-2) and from related service providers. Information about each outcome is reflected in the child's IFSP present levels of functional performance across typical settings and situations that make up his or her daily routines.

Infants and toddlers exiting with less than 6 months of service did not participate in exit surveys. Exit data is collected just prior to exiting the program.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

Guam reported its Part C eligibility criteria includes infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i). However, Guam did not report the baseline and targets through FFY 2025 for its at-risk infants and toddlers for this indicator.

3 - Required Actions

Guam did not provide the baseline or targets for just at-risk infants and toddlers, as required by the Measurement Table. Guam must provide the required baseline and targets through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year's response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2024, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2005	Target>=	96.00%	96.50%	98.00%	88.20%	89.00%
A	91.00 %	Data	100.00%	94.87%	100.00%	88.24%	100.00%
B	2005	Target>=	92.00%	94.00%	98.00%	94.10%	94.60%
B	84.00 %	Data	97.56%	97.44%	90.91%	94.12%	97.06%
C	2005	Target>=	97.00%	97.00%	100.00%	94.10%	94.60%
C	79.00 %	Data	100.00%	100.00%	95.45%	94.12%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A>=	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%
Target B>=	95.10%	95.60%	96.10%	96.60%
Target C>=	95.10%	95.60%	96.10%	96.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	124
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	27
Survey Response Rate	21.77%
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	25
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	27
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	26
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	27
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	26
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	27

Measure	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	100.00%	90.00%	92.59%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	97.06%	95.10%	96.30%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	100.00%	95.10%	96.30%	Met target	No Slippage

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Question	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Survey Response Rate	31.48%	21.77%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness was the ECTA Center representativeness calculation. The calculator uses an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon the 90% confidence intervals for each indicator (significance level = .10). The ECTA Center calculator is excel-based that automatically indicates whether the difference between the target population data and the respondent data is statistically significant. For both the ethnicity and geographic location data, the ECTA Center calculator indicated that the respondent data were representative of the target population.

It should be noted that the ECTA Center excel-based calculator indicated a caution in using the calculator for determining representativeness for small cell sizes in subgroups less than 35.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another category approved through the stakeholder input process.

For this reporting period, there were 27/124 (21.77%) of families who responded to the survey.

GEIS conducted an analysis of the demographics to determine whether the FFY 2022 survey response group was representative of the population served. All families receiving early intervention services for a minimum of 6 months were provided the survey. The survey was distributed using various modes such as hard copies, digital and through phone interviews.

A review by ethnicity revealed that the 27 respondents were representative of the ethnic groups of the target population of infants/toddlers receiving GEIS services when examining the breakdown by OSEP's ethnicity categories. The Pacific Islander, Asian, Two or More, and White ethnicity categories were reported for the target population. These four ethnicity categories were represented in the 27 respondents. The comparison data included:

Asian -Total = 18.55% (23/124); Respondents = 2.42% (3/124); Non-respondents = 16.13% (20/124)
 Pacific Islander -Total = 62.10% (77/124); Respondents = 16.13% (20/124); Non-respondents = 45.97% (57/124)
 Two or More -Total = 17.74% (22/124); Respondents = 2.42% (3/124); Non-respondents = 15.32% (19/124)
 White -Total= 0.81% (1/124); Respondents= 0.81% (1/124); Non-respondents= 0.00% (0/124)
 Black or African American-Total = 0.81% = (1/124); Respondent= 0.00% (0/124); Non-respondent= 0.81% (1/124)

A review of geographic location also indicated that the 27 respondents were representative of the geographic location of the infants/toddlers receiving GEIS services, the target population. The geographic location reviewed was the region of the island in which the infants/toddlers reside: Northern, Central, Southern, or Other/Unknown. The comparison data included:

Central region = Target = 34.68% (43/124); Respondents = 59.26% (13/124); Non-respondents= 24.19%(30/124)
 Southern region = Target = 23.39% (29/124); Respondents = 18.52% (6/124); Non-respondents= 18.55%(23/124)
 Northern region = Target = 41.94% (52/124); Respondents = 22.22 % (8/124); Non-respondents= 35.48%(44/124)

For this reporting period, there were 124 surveys disseminated, 27 or 21.77% (27/124) completed the survey. This is a decrease in respondents from the last reporting period, which was 34 or 31.48% (34/108) in FFY 2021.

The demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. (yes/no)

YES

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

Throughout the reporting period, GEIS disseminated 124 surveys to parents of infants and toddlers receiving services for a minimum of 6 months. Surveys were disseminated to parents via service coordinators who met their parents at a home visit, either in-person or virtual. In addition, the survey was distributed using various modes such as hard copies, digital, and through phone interviews with service coordinators or GEIS administrative staff. Stakeholders recommended that the GEIS CQI team will drill down the procedures for disseminating, collecting and reporting the data, and determine additional steps needed to address the low number of respondents, reviewing each level to determine different options on how we can present or share the survey to parents, and agreed that the Program Coordinator shall monitor and continue to conduct individual follow up with service coordinators and service providers. In addition, these additional steps will be discussed with stakeholders for their input, and guidance will be provided to all staff regarding new procedures.

Based on stakeholder input the following strategies for monitoring and tracking survey returns will include the following procedures:

For parents that have not submitted their surveys, GEIS have in place strategies to support the dissemination and submission of the surveys through 3

levels of attempts: Level 1: In March, the Data Manager reviews a data report of all surveys submitted and sends email reminders to Service Coordinators of those families that have yet to complete the survey. Service Coordinators are to connect with parents via phone or email to complete the survey;

Level 2: In April, the Data office prepares hard copies of blank surveys for families that have yet to submit their surveys. These blank surveys are inserted into envelopes for Service Providers to bring with them to home visiting sessions, and request that parents complete the surveys. After receiving the surveys the Service Provider will submit it to the Data Office. Level 3: Program Coordinator and administrative support staff will make phone contacts with parent encouraging to complete the survey. If needed, staff will drop off the survey and wait for families to complete it or request that families come into the office to complete and submit the survey. In these instances families will be provided an incentive.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Throughout the reporting period, GEIS disseminated 124 surveys to parents of infants and toddlers receiving services for a minimum of 6 months. Surveys were disseminated to parents via service coordinators who met their parents at a home visit, either in-person or virtual. In addition, the surveys were distributed using various modes such as hard copies, digital, and through phone interviews with service coordinators or GEIS administrative staff.

Although the demographic of parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving GEIS services. GEIS will review the procedures for disseminating the surveys to increase the number of respondents, especially in regions with the most population.

In the review of geographic location, the respondents represented a majority of the villages where the majority of infants and toddlers served reside. The 27 respondents were from the different regions of the island: 59.26% (13/124) were families in the central part of Guam; 22.22 % (8/124) from the northern villages; and 18.52% (6/124) were from families living in the southern villages.

Based on the dissemination process throughout the year and the geographic location of respondents, GEIS did not identify any nonresponse bias. The level of attempts standard operating procedures, described in the Strategies section above, will continue to be used in subsequent years for completing the family survey.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4 - OSEP Response

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the *EDFacts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.13%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	1.50%	1.55%	1.31%	0.95%	1.00%
Data	0.86%	1.13%	0.86%	0.96%	0.17%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	1.05%	1.10%	1.13%	1.15%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a 'Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

During a stakeholders session the Program reviewed this indicator, and determined that Guam will use the Guam's 2020 Census data from the US Census Bureau which included data of children's age/sex by single years of age. This data provided a more accurate count (by single years of age).

The previous data for the Child Find (Birth to One) population on Guam, was given to us by the US DOE OSEP based on the 2010 Census which was 2917 per year. For this reporting period and forward, GEIS will use the 2020 Guam Population data by sex by single years of age, which reported: For under 1 year is at 2073 (or Birth to 1yr).

For this reporting period, there were 11 infants under age 1 or .53% (11/2073) birth to one served.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	11

Source	Date	Description	Data
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021	06/20/2023	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	2,073

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
11	2,073	0.17%	1.05%	0.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED**Facts** Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations . The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.56%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	2.00%	2.03%	2.03%	1.61%	1.61%
Data	1.31%	1.65%	1.81%	1.62%	1.24%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	1.63%	1.63%	1.65%	1.65%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

During a stakeholders session the Program reviewed this indicator, and determined that Guam will use the Guam's 2020 Census data from the US Census Bureau which included data of children's age/sex by single years of age. This data provided a more accurate count (by single years of age).

The previous data for the Child Find (Birth to Three) population on Guam, was given to us by the US DOE OSEP based on the 2010 Census which was 8690 per year. For this reporting period and forward, GEIS will use the 2020 Guam Population data by sex by single years of age, which reported: For Birth to Three which is at 6190.

For this reporting period, there were 131 infants and toddlers birth to 3 served or 2.12% (131/6190) birth to 3 served.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	131
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races)	06/20/2023	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	6,190

Source	Date	Description	Data
by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021			

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
131	6,190	1.24%	1.63%	2.12%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

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

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.41%	96.90%	97.98%	94.90%	72.85%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
41	140	72.85%	100%	82.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

There were seventy-five (75) with exceptional family circumstances: forty-two (42) parent who cancelled session/meetings, twenty (20) families requested to hold services to a later date, one (1) family preferring to wait while their baby is pending release from the hospital, two (2) families were a no show for scheduled meetings, and two (2) families did not respond to phone calls, written notifications, and one (1) family at the refused early intervention services). There were also seven (7) families with exceptional circumstances due to the typhoon Marwar; requesting for services later after being displaced (moving to different housing or needing to address primary family needs after the typhoon), and one exceptional circumstances due to rescheduling for an assessment due to jury duty.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Guam Part C is reporting data for indicator 7 collected from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Though our verification process, there were 140 infants and toddlers to be evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted within the 45-day timeline with in this reporting period. There were seventy-five (75) with exceptional family circumstances: forty-two (42) parent who cancelled session/meetings, twenty (20) families requested to hold services to a later date, one (1) family preferring to wait while their baby is pending release from the hospital, two (2) families were a no show for scheduled meetings, and two (2) families did not respond to phone calls, written notifications, and one (1) family at the refused early intervention services). There were also seven (6) families with exceptional circumstances due to the typhoon Marwar; requesting for services later after being displaced (moving to different housing or needing to address primary family needs after the typhoon), and one (1) exceptional circumstances due to rescheduling of an assessment due to jury duty.

There were (25) eligible infants that did not have their initial IFSP conducted after the 45 day timeline due to program delays were for the following reasons: Eleven (11) were late due to the lack of personnel, the Team was unable to schedule for timely evaluation and thirteen (13) were late due the scheduling of meetings.

Guam did not meet the 100% compliance for this indicator and reported 82.86% (115/140) for this compliance indicator.

All GEIS Service Coordinators staff met with their IFSP teams monthly to discuss the status of cases. Printouts of cases, which indicate the 45-day "flag" date, are provided to service coordinators monthly so that SCs are alerted to the timeline requirement. Service Coordinators and service providers are required to submit all contact logs of cases to the data office at the end of the month to provide documentation of their efforts in their work with families, to include, strategies and action plans are discussed with staff in working with families as early as possible so that evaluations and IFSPs can be conducted within the required timeline.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

During this reporting period, the program lost their Speech Pathologist, but were able to secure staff by March 2023. The program also secured occupational therapy services from an on-line vendor, but a delay was caused by pending licensure, from the Guam Board of Allied Health Examiners, authorizing the therapists to practice on Guam. These children exited the program to Part B a month after the initial IFSP.

The program also lost a teacher in May (relocated by to the US mainland) and the program has not been able to replace her, due to the shortage of certified teachers on island.

The GEIS is reviewing the procedural manual and identifying activities with in the for the 45-day timeline, and share with families the specific timeline for each activity to complete with the family. This includes clear expectations, such as scheduling for evaluations, planning time and eligibility and initial IFSP dates to agree on. Some families may ask for additional time, and GEIS has included a process in placing cases in a monitoring list, (those with exceptional circumstances), and calling parents to see if they are still have concerns regarding their child's development.

During the stakeholder Input sessions, the follow improvement activities were recommended: 1) Review the program's standard operating procedures with the continuous quality improvement (CQI) team to look at the process, 2) Improve service coordination to ensure parents are provided information on the importance of a child's first three years, and supporting their child's development, and how important the timelines are in the identification/eligibility/and initial services are for their child, 3) Improve service coordination in order to meet the timelines, 4) develop a Rapid Response Team (Triage) to address cases based on critical needs and respond with immediate screening and evaluations.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
17			17

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) is responsible for monitoring and verifying correct implementation of Indicator 7 regulatory requirements. CMO reviews the Guam Early Intervention Services (GEIS), the Part C program, Indicator 7 program data reports to verify that the source of the noncompliance is correctly implementing Indicator 7 regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. On a quarterly basis, CMO reviews Indicator 7 program data reports for updated/subsequent data at 100% compliance to determine whether GEIS is correctly implementing Indicator 7 regulatory requirements.

In FFY 2021, CMO conducted off-site monitoring for Indicator 7 compliance. The off-site monitoring included a review of Indicator 7 program data report for the period of July 1, 2021– March 8, 2022. In March 2022, a Written Notice of Finding of Noncompliance for Indicator 7 was issued to GEIS. The Notice identified 17 individual cases of noncompliance based on the Indicator 7 program data report. The Notice listed the 17 individual cases and indicated that the completion of the 45-timeline and/or reason for delay were not documented.

CMO's quarterly review of Indicator 7 program data report included verification of the dates of the 45-day timeline and reasons for delay for the 17 individual cases of noncompliance. The Indicator 7 program data report showed 14 individual cases were completed over timeline due to program delays noting "team schedule full – unable to schedule" and three individual cases were documented as exceptional family circumstances. These 17 individual cases were part of the FFY 2021 Indicator 7 performance data.

In April 2023, CMO issued to GEIS the Failure to Correct Notice for the noncompliance identified in March 2022. The Notice indicated that CMO was

able to verify the 17 individual cases were corrected, but GEIS has not been able to demonstrate correct implementation of Indicator 7 regulatory requirements through a review of updated/subsequent data at 100% compliance, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Actions Taken to Correct Noncompliance Identified:

With stakeholder input, GEIS will be implementing the following actions:

1. Review the program's standard operating procedures with the continuous quality improvement (CQI) team to look at the process.
2. Improve service coordination to ensure parents are provided information on the importance of a child's first three years, and supporting their child's development, and how important the timelines are in the identification/eligibility/and initial services are for their child.
3. Improve service coordination in order to meet the timelines.
4. Develop a Rapid Response Team (Triage) to address cases based on critical needs and respond with immediate screening and evaluations.

Beginning November 2023, GEIS partnered with the OSEP-funded Collective Impact Model for Part C (CIM-C) Child Find project designed to build local capacity to identify, screen, and refer infants and toddlers to appropriate services. A critical component of the CIM-C framework is family engagement and the development of culturally responsive resources for use with families. This component will assist GEIS in supporting families about the importance of timely early intervention services.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

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

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator and is: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a 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 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Refer to Indicator 7 Data section for a description of the FFY 2021 written notice of findings of noncompliance and the status of the verification of correction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, Guam must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining 17 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	89.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	98.68%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
90	102	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

12

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

There were (12) toddlers exiting Part C who had their initial IFSP with transition steps and services when they were 33 months of age or older at entry. The transition steps were included in their IFSPs and LEA Notifications were provided to the Part B program because each toddler was potentially eligible for Part B services.

These 12 toddlers had documented delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances for their initial IFSP, as reported in Indicator 7 of this FFY 2022 SPP/APR. As described in Indicator 7, the exceptional family circumstances documented included: 10 parents who cancelled session/meetings and two families who requested to hold services to a later date.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Guam Part C is reporting data for indicator 8A collected from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data for Indicator 8A, reports the percent of children "who received services and exited at the transition planning age" with timely planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community service by their 3rd birthday. Data accuracy included verification of data for the reporting period with the 618 reported exit data to determine that it accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full report period. Based on the data report obtained from documentation submitted by the service coordinators, 90 children had written documentation of completion of an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday, and 12 had documented exceptional family circumstances for the delay in completing their initial IFSP at least 90 days prior to their 3rd birthday. This data report was consistent with the 618 reported exit data of children with IFSPs.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

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

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA**

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
71	71	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**Describe the method used to collect these data.**

The Department of Education (DOE) is the State Education Agency, and Lead Agency responsible for administration of Part C and Part B 619 Preschool. There was evidence that the LEA representative through the Part B Preschool Program was notified of the potential Part B eligibility for all children who received GEIS services and were referred to Part B for potential eligibility. A referral is submitted to Part B to notify the program of a child who may be potentially eligible for Part B services. The GEIS Service Coordinator is responsible for submitting the referral and written documentation to the data clerk indicating the date of notification to the Part B program. A report is then generated monthly indicating dates of notification. The GEIS Program Coordinator reviews reports monthly and verifies data via monthly staffing and, when necessary, file review. Data for Indicator 8B, reports the percent of children exiting GEIS where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred within the required Part C regulation timeline for children potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. Data compiled included verification of data for the reporting period and not submitted 618 data. Based on the data report obtained from documentation submitted by the service coordinators, 100% (71/71) of the children who received GEIS services and were referred to the LEA (Part B) for potential Part B eligibility.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)

NO

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Guam Part C is reporting data for Indicator 8B collected from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

There were a total of eighty-three (83) submitted to Part B. Of these, there were twelve (12) children who were not counted in the percentage of children timely transition planning due to their age at the time of the initial IFSP, which were greater than 33 months of age.

The LEA representative through the Part B Preschool Program was notified of toddlers receiving services under the GEIS program for 100% (71/71) of the children who received GEIS services and were referred to Part B for potential Part B eligibility.

The GEIS does not have an opt-out option for families.

The GEIS Program Coordinator reviews reports monthly and verifies data via monthly staffing and, when necessary, file review. This is useful in tracking progress or slippage. Results assist the program with program improvement strategies for this requirement and identifying where technical assistance is needed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

During the stakeholder input session, stakeholders were pleased with the 100% compliance and recommended the program keep the process and continue to look at ways to sustain and make any improvements to process.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

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

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	93.65%	97.50%	96.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. (yes/no)

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
62	71	96.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

9

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

There were nine (9) delays due to exceptional circumstances: five (5) were due to parents cancelling the meeting for session, two (2) requested a hold on services for a later date, two (2) refusing specific services at this time.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Guam Part C is reporting data for indicator 8C collected from July 2022 to June 30 2023

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

There were a total of 83 children with notifications to the LEA. Of the eighty-three children, twelve (12) children who were >33 months of age (who were not counted in the percentage of children timely transition planning due the their age at the time of the initial IFSP.)

Of the remaining seventy-one (71) children: there were sixty-two (62) children who had their transition conference timely, and nine (9) children with documented parent delays: five (5) were due to parents cancelling the meeting for session, two (2) requested a hold on services for a later date, two (2) refusing specific services at this time.

The GEIS Service Coordinator is responsible for submitting the referral and written documentation to the GEIS data clerk indicating the date of notification to the Part B program. A report is then generated monthly indicating dates of notification. The GEIS Program Coordinator reviews reports monthly and verifies data via monthly staffing and, when necessary, file review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

During the stakeholder input session, stakeholders were pleased with the 100% compliance and recommended the the program keep the process and continue to look at ways to sustain and make any improvements to process.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3		0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.**

GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) is responsible for monitoring and verifying correct implementation of Indicator 8C regulatory requirements. CMO reviews the Guam Early Intervention Services (GEIS), the Part C program, Indicator 8C program data reports to verify that the source of the noncompliance is correctly implementing Indicator 8C regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. On a quarterly basis, CMO reviews Indicator 8C program data reports for updated/subsequent data at 100% compliance to determine whether GEIS is correctly implementing Indicator 8C regulatory requirements.

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

CMO verifies each individual case of noncompliance identified was corrected through a review of GEIS Indicator 8C program data reports.

In FFY 2021, CMO conducted off-site monitoring for Indicator 8C compliance. The off-site monitoring included a review of Indicator 8C program data report for the period of July 1, 2021– March 8, 2022. In March 2022, a Written Notice of Finding of Noncompliance for Indicator 8C was issued to GEIS. The Notice identified three individual cases of noncompliance based on the Indicator 8C program data report. The Notice listed the three individual cases and indicated that the timeline for the 90-day transition conference and/or reason for delay was not documented.

CMO's quarterly review of Indicator 8C program data report included verification of the dates when the 90-day transition conference was held for the three individual cases of noncompliance. The Indicator 8C program data report documented the three cases of transition conference were delayed due to exceptional family circumstances. The three exceptional family circumstances were included in the FFY 2021 Indicator 8C performance data. CMO's verification of correction of the three individual cases raised concerns regarding the program data reports not reflecting accurate timelines and reasons for delay. GEIS reported the process for inputting data into the system in a timely manner has been a challenge.

Within one-year from March 2022, CMO issued to GEIS the Verified Timely Correction Notice for the noncompliance identified, which included verified correction of the individual cases of noncompliance (three exceptional family circumstances). In addition, the notice included GEIS demonstrating 100% compliance of updated/subsequent data, which served as evidence of GEIS correctly implementing Indicator 8C regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In addition, the FFY 2022 Indicator 8C performance data at 100% compliance indicates GEIS continues to correctly implement Indicator 8C regulatory requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

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

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator and is: (1) 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 2022 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Refer to Indicator 8C Data section for a description of the FFY 2021 written notice of findings of noncompliance and verified timely correction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

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

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

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

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target>=					

Data					
------	--	--	--	--	--

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=				

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As per OSEP, Guam is not required to provide target until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held. There were not hearing requests that went to resolution sessions during this reporting period. There were no hearing requests that went to resolution sessions during this reporting period. Guam Part C follows the Guam Part B due process hearing procedures

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED**Facts** Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=				

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As per OSEP, Guam is not required to provide target until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held. There were no hearing requests that went to resolution sessions during this reporting period. There were no hearing requests that went to resolution sessions during this reporting period. Guam Part C follows the Guam Part B due process hearing procedures

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

Guam reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. Guam is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

11 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

By June 2026, 64.5% of infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) and who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

GEIS has included the Theory of Action, and Implementation Plan for Indicator 11) on the GEIS website: <https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/3-Guam-Early-Intervention-Services> (click on grants and reports on left side), and <http://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	46.30%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	53.50%	57.10%	60.70%	64.50%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
27	57	60.00%	53.50%	47.37%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Guam's SiMR measurement is : The percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who substantially increased who were functioning within age expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

For this reporting period there were 57 out of the 66 infants and toddlers that exited and participated in the outcome measure for Summary Statement 1. There were 27 out of the 57 or 47.47% children who substantially increased their rate of growth in the area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. This is slippage of 12.63% as compared to FFY 2021 at 60%.

Stakeholders recommended that the following drill down data be reviewed to determine possible reasons for slippage: age at entry, service time, and disability, for children in category "c". As indicated in the reporting, category "b" are children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers by the time they exited the program. There were 30 out of the 66 or 45.5% of children who exited in category "b".

Age at Entry: Of the 30 children, there were 6 children that were less than 11 months old, 10 children were between 12 months and 23 months of age and 14 between 24 and 36 months of age.

Service Time: Eighteen (18) children received less than 11 months of early intervention services, 7 received 12 to 23 months of services, and 5 received 23 to 36 months of service.

Disability: Five (5) had established conditions, one with biological risk factors, and 24 were eligible as developmental delay.

Stakeholders discussed that the average age children enrolled into early intervention is at 18 months of age and received an average of 14.4 months of early intervention services. Overall, the data indicates that children are not accessing services in the first year of life. For this reporting period, about half of the staff have been with GEIS for less than 2 years and therefore, professional development continues to be a priority to ensure that providers have adequate to advanced level of confidence and understanding of the evidence-based practices that are used to support the child and family. Stakeholders discussed and agreed to the following improvement strategies:

Frequency: Stakeholders discussed the number of monthly services provided to families and encouraged the team to relook at family needs and increase services if families need more support.

Provider's Competencies: Stakeholders felt the importance of providing training for the new staff and booster sessions on early childhood coaching, routines-based interview, and embedment of child outcomes into the IFSP process.

Parent Competencies: Stakeholders believed the importance to determine parent knowledge and comfort levels when discussing the use and implementation of strategies. The focus of training is to provide parents with applied practice in using tips and ideas to support their child's expressive language and overall development within their daily routine.

Resources: Stakeholders shared that more online resources would provide families with the support needed while waiting for the next visit with their service provider. This will include, for example, online Parenting Curriculum (Birth-8 years) training that provides short videos sent to families through weekly emails like the Teaching Strategies Ready Rosie that was implemented Fall 2023.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

GEIS continues to use the following data sources to determine the State Improved Measurable Results:

1. CHILD DATA

Individual child data from the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP) is used to determine the child's present level of performance and in the development and monitoring of the child's Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) in conjunction with other sources of information to determine the status of the performance in the early childhood outcomes. Most of the information is collected as part of the development of the child's IFSP; therefore, collecting child assessment information is part of the IFSP 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 in his or her natural environment. Information from the family and service providers in contact with the child is considered in deciding the rating for each outcome. Various 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 or observation; Service Provider input/observation; Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP); the Guam Early Learning Guidelines; the Developmental Assessment of Young Children – 2nd Edition (DAYC-2) and from related service providers. Information about each outcome is reflected in the child's IFSP present levels of functional performance across typical settings and situations that make up his or her daily routines. Infants and toddlers exiting with less than 6 months of service did not participate in exit surveys. Exit data is collected just prior to exiting the program.

Based on input from GEIS staff and stakeholders, it was agreed to collect and review data that address children's expressive language skills using six specific strands from the HELP that will be captured to determine progress for GEIS secondary data point: By 2026, 71.90% children exiting the program will have increased in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills in the area of expressive language using the ECO HELP Checklist.

2. PARENT SURVEYS

GEIS continues to disseminate the Indicator 4: Annual Parent Survey and the GEIS 6-Month IFSP Review Family Survey to capture families knowledge about available community resources and supports and knowledge of how to support their child's early learning/language and communication development.

3. SERVICE PROVIDERS /SERVICE COORDINATORS SELF ASSESSMENT SURVEY

GEIS conducted a "Self Assessment" to identify the strengths and needs in implementing evidence-based practices (EBPs). The Stakeholders indicated this will identify and prioritize training needs and support of providers/ service coordinators. In addition, GEIS conducts observations with Service Providers to assess the fidelity of implementation of EBPs using two Case Tools: Family Centered Practices and Everyday Child Learning Opportunities. These Case Tools were developed by Rush & Shelden and based on the Coaching Practices Rating Scale.

4. COMMUNITY PARTNER SURVEYS

GEIS conducts two surveys that are disseminated to early childhood partners to collect data on connections among and between partners and track level of connection and coordination. Information documents 3 types of activities which they engage with GEIS such as cooperative, coordinated, and integrated activities. The second survey is to capture supports administrators provide their staff in participating in working with and in participating in professional development and supporting early childhood initiatives.

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

CHILD DATA:

The Guam Early Intervention System uses multiple sources of information to determine the status of the early childhood outcomes. Most of the information is collected as part of the development of the child's IFSP; therefore, collecting child assessment information is part of the IFSP 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: 1) The summary information for child outcomes is expected to take into account the child's functioning in his or her natural environment. Information from the family and service providers in contact with the child is considered in deciding the rating for each outcome 2) Many types of information are used in determining the child's status relative to the child outcomes. These may include, but not be limited to: parent input/observation; Service Provider input/observation; Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP); the Guam Early Learning Guidelines; the Developmental Assessment of Young Children – 2nd Edition (DAYC-2) and from related service providers; 3) Information about each outcome is reflected in the child's IFSP present levels functional performance across typical settings and situations that make up his or her daily routines. 4) Infants and toddlers exiting with less than 6 months of service did not participate in exit surveys. Exit data is collected just prior to exiting the program.

Data collection procedures for gathering data for the secondary data set is based on the Early Childhood Outcome (ECO), HELP Checklist that was developed by aligning skills pertaining to expressive language that were noted in the HELP strands. For this reporting period, stakeholders discussed the specific data needed to respond to the secondary data point: By 2026, 71.90% children exiting the program will have increased in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills in the area of expressive language using the ECO HELP Checklist. Through rich discussion, the stakeholders agreed to target only expressive language skills in six areas. These areas on the HELP checklist include 2-3: Expressive Language; 2-4A: Communicating with Others Gesturally; 2-4B: Communicating with Others Verbally; 2-5: Learning Grammar and Sentence Structure; 2-6: Development of Sounds & Intelligibility; and 2-7: Communicating through Rhythm. As a result of the input gathered, GEIS will focus on the specific skills pertaining to expressive language. For SPP FFY 2020 to 2025, stakeholders agreed that expressive language be the focus of professional development and set targets to increase performance by 3% each year.

GEIS will continue to use items from the HELP strand that most closely relate to the SiMR in the area of expressive language to create the ECO HELP Checklist. The data is used to support the collection and reporting for GEIS Secondary Data point. This process entails—1) GEIS service providers complete the ECO HELP Checklist for each child that is exiting the program; 2) The ECO Checklist is transmitted to the Data Manager, who inputs the data into the ECO HELP Excel data program. 3) The ECO HELP Data is aggregated and a ECO HELP Summary Report is provided to the Program Coordinator for review.

PARENT SURVEYS:

The data collection is collected to respond to the performance measures includes multiple sources: 1) responses from the Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 4 Annual Family Feedback Survey, and 2) responses from the GEIS 6-month IFSP Review Family Survey.

The Annual Parent Survey is conducted throughout the reporting period specifically during the Annual IFSP or prior to exiting. Surveys are disseminated to parents via service coordinators who meet their parents during a home visit, either in-person or virtual. The surveys are distributed using various modes such as hard copies, digital, and through phone interviews with service coordinators or GEIS administrative staff.

GEIS tracks and monitors the dissemination and submission of all surveys. For parents that have not submitted their surveys, GEIS have in place strategies to support the dissemination and submission of the surveys through 3 levels of attempts: Level 1: In March, the Data Manager reviews a data report of all surveys submitted and sends email reminders to Service Coordinators of those families that have yet to complete the survey. Service Coordinators are to connect with parents via phone or email to complete the survey; Level 2: In April, the Data office prepares hard copies of blank surveys for families that have yet to submit their surveys. These blank surveys are inserted into envelopes for Service Providers to bring with them to home visiting sessions, and request that parents complete the surveys. After receiving the surveys the Service Provider will submit it to the Data Office. Level 3: Program Coordinator and administrative support staff will make phone contacts with parent encouraging to complete the survey. If needed, staff will drop off the survey and wait for families to complete it or request that families come into the office to complete and submit the survey. In these instances families will be provided an incentive.

The GEIS 6-Month Family Survey is disseminated at the 6-Months IFSP Review meeting. The Service Coordinator discuss with the parents how they would like to receive this survey either by hard copy or through a google survey format. The Data Office receives the hard copies from Service Coordinators and monitors and tracks all surveys that are submitted online. GEIS has in place procedures for disseminating and collecting surveys from families that have not yet submitted their document using the level of attempts noted earlier.

There are three items from the indicator 4 Annual Family Feedback Survey that are more closely related to the measure. These are -- Know about services in the community; I know where to go for support to meet my family's needs; and I know where to go for support to meet my child's needs.

The specific items from the GEIS 6-month IFSP Review Family Survey that were analyzed to provide information for the performance measure are: 1) It was easy to find out about early intervention services that are available in the community; 2) GEIS has been helpful in connecting my child and family with other services or programs that can help us. 3) It was easy to get my child and family involved with early intervention services; 4) Over the past months/years, GEIS has helped me and/or my family understand the roles of the people who work with my child and family; 5) I know who to call if I have problems with the services and support my child and family are receiving; and 6) I am comfortable asking for services and support that my child and family needs.

SERVICE PROVIDER/SERVICE COORDINATOR SELF ASSESSMENT

In August of each year, a link to the self assessment survey are sent via email to each providers/coordinator and requested for them to complete. The Provider Self-Assessment consist of 30 questions and providers are asked to rate their levels of confidence in implementing the 11 coherent strategies. The Service Coordinator's Self Assessment included 13 questions that rates their levels of confidence in implementing the coherent strategies.

The self-assessments results are analyzed to determine the areas of strengths and needs and to prioritize professional development activities support providers/ coordinators.

COMMUNITY PARTNER SURVEY

Data is collected from community partners using 2 surveys: 1) GEIS Partner Survey is disseminated by the Program Coordinator to all community partners via email with a link to access the survey. 2) Administrators' Survey is conducted by Guam CEDDERS via email, interview, or text. These data are analyzed to determine the types of activities and levels of support provided by administrators in supporting professional development and early childhood initiatives.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

In addition to the data collected and reported for indicator 3 B Summary Statement 1 and the ECO HELP Data Report, GEIS connects the following data to provide a comprehensive report of not only child's performance, but in assessing parents' levels of confidence and competence in supporting their child's overall development with specific focus on expressive language. GEIS annually assess providers knowledge and skills in implementing GEIS models: 1) Early Childhood Coaching, 2) Routines Based-Interview, and 3) Division of Early Childhood (DEC) evidence-based practices to the fidelity. GEIS is currently in full implementation of these models and have prioritized targeted the need for ongoing training and coaching for the 3 staff that have 1 year of work experience and with 2 additional Service providers hired this reporting period and 2 that resigned. These targeted training includes the Early Childhood Outcome Measure Key Practices, Routines Based Intervention, and the Early Childhood Coaching. Additional booster follow-up early childhood coaching sessions are planned for Spring 2023 to measure implementation of early childhood coaching to fidelity.

The following are data is captured and reported with Guam's SiMR annual reporting:

Child Assessment:

1. Indicator 3 Child Outcome Measurement process
2. ECO HELP Assessment Checklist: Captures child data and the progress made in the area of expressive language skills.

Parent Assessment:

1. Annual Family Feedback Survey – Indicator 4
2. GEIS 6-Month IFSP Family Survey – This survey is disseminated at the IFSP Review meeting and captures parent's feedback on how to improve the early intervention services they are receiving, the types of training, and connecting with other community partners.

Service Provider / Coordinator Assessment:

1. Annual Service Provider/ Coordinator Self-Assessment Survey: This self-assessment determines the level of confidence in implementing the 10 evidence-based practices.
2. Observations using 3 tools – 1) Case Tools – Family Centered Practices and Everyday Child and Learning Opportunities; and the GEIS Coaching Fidelity Checklist which includes 38 items specific to coaching practices was implemented with the providers to measure if the coaching model is being implemented to fidelity. These tools are used to measure the implementation of coaching to the fidelity of the model.

Community Partners:

1. Community Partner Survey: Provides information of cooperation, coordination, and integrated activities and initiatives across early childhood community partners.
2. Early Childhood Administrator's Survey: Provides information from community partners on their experience and challenges to collaboration.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

GEIS SPP/APR 2022-2023 report on the GEIS website:

<https://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/3-Guam-Early-Intervention-Services> (click on grants and reports on left side), and
<http://www.gdoe.net/District/Department/2-Special-Education>

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

NO

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

The following summary provides information on the infrastructure improvement strategies:

FAMILY SUPPORTS (FS):

In collaboration, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) Leadership Team expand the process for community- based parent / family engagement activities such as Family Learning Sessions, Strengthening Families virtual Parent Café, Village Play Time events that included using the Teaching Strategies Ready Rosie online parenting tips, and the Library Story hour. This aligns with the intended outcome to link with community-based programs (CBPs) and with a focus on sharing tips and ideas to promote the child's expressive language and overall development with in the family's daily routine. For this reporting period majority of families are served in home setting, however, there are few families that have requested to continue virtual services.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD):

GEIS has prioritize professional development activities to support the 2 new service providers to adequately prepared to work with families and caregivers by:

- Disseminating the Professional Development Self-Assessment Tool that addresses competency areas for EC providers to include evidenced based practices that promote early learning language/communication and literacy.
- analyzing existing PD to include different available options such as virtual; in-person; and develop methods to offer trainings asynchronously.
- Continuing the use EBPs and training modules that include Early Childhood Coaching, IFSP process, Early Start Denver Model – Family Coaching, Routine Based Intervention, Teaching Strategies, ADOS2, Early Childhood Transition, Early Childhood outcomes, and EBPs to promote expressive language skills.
- Incorporating the FLARE (Functional IFSP Outcomes to Guide Intervention; Learning More to Ensure a Deeper Understanding; Action and Trying Strategies; Reflection and Responsive Feedback; and End Visit Planning for Between and Next Visit) framework to document outcomes and next steps during home visits. The FLARE framework uses the early childhood coaching model coupled with the routines-based intervention (RBI) evidence-based model

LOCAL PRACTITIONER (LP):

GEIS, in collaboration with GELC workgroups, continues to update and implement Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), such as the Island-wide Developmental and Behavioral Screening System (iDBSS), Health and Wellness - Multi-Agency Team that support children that require a supports with two or more agencies using system of care approach, the revision of the early childhood transition process with early childhood special education services and with community partners.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

FAMILY SUPPORTS:**Intended Outcomes**

- GEIS identifies and develops linkages with community-based programs (CBPs) and parent support groups that focus on sharing of strategies to address family and child needs.

Short Term:

- Parents and EI staff are knowledgeable about community-based resources.
- Parents have skill sets to participate actively in supporting their child's overall development.

Intermediate:

- Parents will access community-based resources.
- Parent/child interactions will increase in both quality and quantity to help their child grow and learn

Progress to date:

Parents have access to community- based parent / family engagement activities such as Strengthening Families Parent Café and parent curriculum

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:**Intended Outcomes:**

GEIS identifies and/or develops and implements the professional development resources and mechanisms for ongoing support necessary to ensure early intervention service providers, including service coordinators and contracted providers, consistently use coaching and natural learning environment practices when planning and delivering early intervention services

Short Term:

- EC providers will have knowledge and skills on evidence-based practices that promote children's acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy).
- EC administrators/supervisors will have knowledge and skills to support EC providers on evidence-based practices within the primary provider and coaching model with fidelity.
- EC providers will have improved understanding and skills of child outcomes, child development, including evidence-based practices to support acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.
- EC providers will have greater understanding family's needs and will be able to better communicate to improve families' understanding of IFSP and acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.

Intermediate Term:

- EC providers will implement effective evidenced practices that promote children's acquisition and use of knowledge (including early language/communication and early literacy) interventions and supports to children and families.
- The quality and quantity of parent-child engagement will improve and increase.
- EC providers will access coaching/mentoring support to improve understanding and skills of child outcomes, child development, including evidence-based practices to support acquisition and use of knowledge and skill.

Progress to date:

GEIS continues to use EBPs to include Early Childhood Coaching, IFSP process, Early Start Denver Model – Family Coaching, Routine Based Intervention, Teaching Strategies, EBPs to promote expressive language skills; Strengthening Families, Tele-Intervention: Distance Education Learning, Strategies in working with parents, Service Coordinator Training, etc.

GEIS continue to use the professional development resources and mechanisms for ongoing support necessary to ensure early intervention service providers, including service coordinators and contracted providers, consistently use coaching and natural learning environment practices when planning and delivering early intervention services

LOCAL PRACTITIONER:**Intended Outcomes**

- GEIS improves strategic engagement with all early childhood community partners, including the development of an integrated referral system (web-based).

Short Term:

- EC providers will have knowledge and skills to implement effective strategic engagement with community partners and to promote early learning language/communication and early literacy.
- EC providers will have skill sets to effectively implement the SOP with community partners and evidenced based strategies to promote early learning language/communication and early literacy.

Intermediate Term:

- EC providers will have in place collaborative partnership and demonstrate effective use of the SOP with community partners.
- EC providers will coordinate services across community partners to better serve young children and their families by providing family driven, - LC, individualized, and coordinated service delivery that promotes early learning language/communication and early literacy.

Parents will access EC services across community partners that promote early learning language/communication and early literacy that meets the needs of child and family.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

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

Based on stakeholder input the following improvement strategies added to the Family and Local Practitioner implementation plans:

FAMILY SUPPORTS:

To update the procedures to ensure family training is embedded into the IFSP.

Provide booster training sessions on the results of the GEIS 6-Months Survey. This will provide targets discussion with families on tips and ideas to promote expressive language / communication within a child's daily routine.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

To update the EC professional development plan that will provide targeted training for service providers on expressive language/ communications skills of young children using the HELP ECO checklist. The HELP ECO checklist include six areas that support expressive language skills.

LOCAL PRACTITIONER:

To provide public awareness information for parents reinforcing the importance of positively engaging in expressive language of children with a child's daily routine.

List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period:

GEIS continues to provide training to build confidence and competences of the service providers and to ensure evidence-based strategies or models are implemented to fidelity. These models include: 1) Routines Based Intervention, 2) Early Childhood Coaching and have expanded the strategies by using the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) Family Coaching and the ESDM Help Is In Your Hands Parent modules, and 3) Infusing and using Child and Family Outcomes throughout the IFSP process. GEIS continues to monitor and evaluate these strategies through the implementation of the Early Childhood Coaching (FLARE) plans at home visiting sessions, direct observations, and assessing the coaching practices using the Guam Early Childhood Coaching Fidelity Checklists.

In addition, GEIS continues to provide Family Learning Sessions on evidence-based strategies at support a child's expressive language skills. The focus of these learning sessions is to provide opportunities for parents to apply these strategies and share their learning with other families. In addition, service providers share additional tools and resources when working with infants and toddlers and their families during regular scheduled home visiting sessions.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

1. The Family Learning Sessions were held this reporting period: Babbles, Bubbles, and Boo...on: "Singing Songs and Rhymes", "Turn Taking", "Tuning In" and "Reading Books", Commenting and Narrating". These sessions provide tips and ideas that parents could do to support their child's expressive language development. These EPBs are shared with families during these sessions.

2. Early Childhood Coaching training was provided to five new service providers that were hire by October 2021.

3. Routine based interview training for new service providers will be facilitated by Dr. Naomi Younggren upon agreement of schedule.

4. Training on the Early Start Denver Model: Family Coaching will be provided to new service providers upon completion of Early Childhood Coaching booster sessions and observation documenting Early Childhood Coaching practices are implemented to the fidelity of the model .

5. GEIS continues to use the following eleven (11) coherent evidence-base DEC practices (EBPs) strategies to reflect how its supports activities that focus on improving outcomes or results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and links to the SiMR. The eleven (11) EBPs that were identified (under the area and item#) include the following:

•Assessment #11: Practitioners report assessment results so that they are understandable and useful to families.

•Environment #1: Practitioners provide services and supports in natural and inclusive environments during daily routines and activities to promote the child's access to and participation in learning experiences.

•Family #1: Practitioner's build trusting and respectful partnerships with the family through interactions that are sensitive and responsive to cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity.

•Family #4: Practitioners support family functioning, promote family confidence and competence, and strengthen family-child relationships by acting in ways that recognize and build on family strengths and capacities.

•Instruction #2: Practitioners, with the family, identify skills to target for instruction that help a child become adaptive, competent, socially connected, and engaged and that promote learning in natural and inclusive environments.

•Instruction #13: Practitioners use coaching or consultation strategies with primary caregivers or other adults to facilitate positive adult-child interactions and instruction intentionally designed to promote child learning and development.

•Interaction #2: Practitioners promote the child's social development by encouraging the child to initiate or sustain positive interactions with other children and adults during routines and activities through modeling, teaching, feedback, or other types of guided support.

•Interaction #4: Practitioners promote the child's cognitive development by observing, interpreting, and responding intentionally to the child's exploration, play, and social activity by joining in and expanding on the child's focus, actions, and intent.

•Team and Collaboration #2: Practitioners and families work together as a team to systematically and regularly exchange expertise, knowledge, and information to build team capacity and jointly solve problems, plan, and implement interventions.

•Team and Collaboration #4: Team members assist each other to discover and access community-based services and other informal and formal resources to meet family-identified child or family needs.

•Transition #1: Practitioners in sending and receiving programs exchange information before, during, and after transition about practices most likely to support the child's successful adjustment and positive outcomes.

6. GEIS will expand training for service providers and service coordinators on EBPs practices by implementing the Teaching Strategies Creative Curriculum and TSGold Assessment.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practices and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child/outcomes.

1. The Family Learning Sessions: Babbles, Bubbles, and Boo are virtual parent interactive events that – 1) shares EBP/strategies that enhances the parent's capacity to support and nurture their child's expressive language skills; 2) allows families to meet other parents and shares tips that have worked for them; and 3) parents may bring up and concerns or recommendation of how to improves early intervention services and supports.

2. GEIS continues to implement the Early Childhood Coaching model in their interactions with families at home visiting sessions. This is the primary model used by service provider to enhance the parents capacity in strategies that would promote early literacy, language, and communication skills within the child's daily routine. GEIS continues to use the EI Visit Coaching Framework that provides a structure for planning and conducting intervention visits. This framework is called the FLARE which stands for the following:

-Functional IFSP Outcomes to Guide Intervention

-Learning More to Ensure a Deeper Understanding

-Action and Trying Strategies

-Reflection and Responsive Feedback

-End Visit Planning for Between and Next Visit Action

3. Routine-based Interviews RBI: RBI is a needs assessment and is an evidence-based practice designed to help families decide on outcomes/goals for their individualized plans, to provide a description of child and family functioning, and to establish an immediately positive relationship between the family and the professional.

4. The Early Start Denver Model (ESDM) Family Coaching: The aim of ESDM Parent Coaching is to provide parents/caregivers with tools and strategies to teach and engage their child through play and everyday routines such as mealtimes, bathing, dressing.

5. The eleven DEC practices identified are aligned to the coherent strategies that supports GEIS's SiMR

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

A1: Performance:

- Know about services in the community at 96.3%
- know where to go for support to meet my family's needs at 96.3%
- know where to go for support to meet my child's needs at 96.3%
- It was easy to find out about early intervention services that are available in the community at 86.4%.
- It was easy to get my child and family involved with early intervention services at 90.90%.
- GEIS has been helpful in connecting my child and family with other services or programs that can help us at 95.4%.
- I am comfortable asking for services and supports that my child and family needs at 97.7%.
- I know who to call if I have problems with the services and supports my child and family are receiving at 86.4%.
- Over the past months/years, GEIS has helped me and/my family understand the roles of people who work with my child and family at 93.2%.

A1: Performance Rating: Overall performance: 93.21% or 3=Strong Performance

A2: Percent increase in number/types of community partners accessed by parents/families to support their child's early language/communication and early literacy development

A2: Performance: Of the 35 partners listed, families reported 41 connections with agencies/ organization (41 out of 44 respondents or 93.18%).

A2: Rating for Performance: 3 = Strong Performance

A3: Percent % increase in parents reporting they support their child's early learning language/communication development

A3: Performance: : Of the total % of survey items from 20 to 28 = 875.1 divide by 9 (items) =

Overall average is 97.23%

A3: Rating of Performance: 3= Strong Performance

B: Percent of EI/EC providers demonstrating knowledge of evidenced-based practices related to early language/communication and early literacy.

B: Performance: % of 3-Adequate or 4- Advanced responses indicating their knowledge and confidence in implementing strategies for each training event x 8 training events. $637/8 \times 100 = 79.62\%$

B: Rating Performance: 2=Moderate Performance

C: Percent of community partners coordinating to promote early learning language/communication

C: Performance: Cooperative Activities = 44%; Coordinated Activities = 44%; Integrated = 12%

Overall Percentage: 56%

C: Rating Performance: 1 = Low Performance

D: Percent of EI/EC administrators reporting adequate support to EI/EC providers related to early language/communication and early literacy.

D: Performance: $11/15 = 73.33\%$ of Administrators indicated adequate support

D: Rating Performance: 2=Moderate Performance

E: Percent of EI/EC providers implementing evidenced-based practices related to early learning language/communication and early literacy with fidelity

E: Performance: Not Rated

Everyday Child Learning Opportunities were completed) indicating: Overall performance was at 91.8% practices observed.

E: Rating Performance: Not Rated

F: Percent increase of children improving on their measurable goals regarding early language/communication and early literacy.

F: Performance: Of the 66 children exiting, there were a total of 313 communication and cognitive goals.

Of which 117 were met and 165 emerging = $282/313 = 90.9\%$

F: Rating Performance: 3=STRONG PERFORMANCE

G: Percent increase of children making "greater than expected" growth in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) by the time they exit the Guam Early Intervention System

G: Performance: Of the 40 infants and toddlers that exited, 24 reported substantially increased their rate of growth in the use of knowledge and skills in language and communication. $27 / 57 = 46.43\%$

G: Rating Performance: 1=Low Performance

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

GEIS stakeholders agreed to continue to implement the existing SSIP Implementation Plan.

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

GEIS stakeholders agreed to continue to implement the existing SSIP Implementation Plan.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2022-2023 SPP/APR/SSIP. These partners included members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant Birth-5 Project, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council.

There was a total of 25 stakeholders who attended the virtual indicator cluster stakeholder meetings held on January 2, 2024 and a second indicator cluster stakeholder sessions held on January 3, 2023 which was also held virtually. An in-person and virtual large stakeholder session was held in the morning and on Saturday, January 6, 2024 to accommodate more parents. We also added a session on January 29, 2024 to share the indicators and the SSIP with the GEIS staff. These sessions used infographics to provide a picture of each indicator in efforts to increase stakeholder understanding. Using a Parent Café' model, stakeholders were placed in small groups to discuss strategies and ideas to improve performance that would result in positive outcomes for the child and family.

The Stakeholders who were in attendance at these three input sessions comprised of 4 parents, 4 GICC members, 13 GEIS staff, and 4 community partners. These sessions included a review of performance for each indicator and focused discussion to gather feedback and recommendations for possible revisions to results targets and required explanation of slippage for relevant indicators.

In addition, two input sessions were held with GEIS staff to review performance for Guam's SiMR. Stakeholders reviewed Part C FFY 2022-2023 SSIP Evaluation Table Summary and later worked in small groups to review and provide recommendation and updates to the implementation plans that included new activities.

In January 31, 2024, the Part C Evaluation Team met to review the Evaluation Plan Summary that includes the nine performance measures and performance for this reporting period. The Team reviewed each performance indicator, discussed the evaluation activity and analysis, and reviewed the assigned rating based on the data analysis. The Team concurred with each rating for performance indicators.

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

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholders recommended that the GEIS CQI team will drill down the procedures for disseminating, collecting and reporting the data, and determine additional steps needed to address the low number of respondents, reviewing each level to determine different options on how we can present or share the survey to parents, and agreed that the Program Coordinator shall monitor and continue to conduct individual follow up with service coordinators and service providers. In addition, these additional steps will be discussed with stakeholders for their input, and guidance will be provided to all staff regarding new procedures.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

None

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

None

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role

Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

Tom Babauta

Title:

Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

Email:

tcbabauta@gdoe.net

Phone:

(671)777-7732

Submitted on:

04/23/24 7:55:35 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Guam

2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
71.43%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	8	4	50.00%
Compliance	14	13	92.86%

2024 Part C Results Matrix

I. Data Quality

(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State's 2021 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e., outcome data)	66
Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e., 618 exiting data)	128
Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%)	51.56
Data Completeness Score (please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation)	1

(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in your State's FFY 2021 Outcomes Data

Data Anomalies Score (please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation)	2
---	---

II. Child Performance

(a) Data Comparison: Comparing your State's 2022 Outcomes Data to other States' 2022 Outcomes Data

Data Comparison Score (please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation)	0
--	---

(b) Performance Change Over Time: Comparing your State's FFY 2022 data to your State's FFY 2021 data

Performance Change Score (please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation)	1
---	---

Summary Statement Performance	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1 (%)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS1 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS2 (%)
FFY 2022	52.00%	42.42%	47.37%	31.82%	50.00%	30.30%
FFY 2021	55.26%	39.58%	60.00%	33.33%	55.26%	43.75%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part C."

2024 Part C Compliance Matrix

Part C Compliance Indicator (2)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3)	Score
Indicator 1: Timely service provision	91.74%	YES	2
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline	82.86%	NO	1
Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 8B: Transition notification	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference	100.00%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	N/A		N/A
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-C_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for an indicator.

Appendix A

I. (a) Data Completeness:

The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2022 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 data. A percentage for your State was computed by dividing the number of children reported in your State's Indicator C3 data by the number of children your State reported exited during FFY 2022 in the State's FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 Exit Data.

Data Completeness Score	Percent of Part C Children included in Outcomes Data (C3) and 618 Data
0	Lower than 34%
1	34% through 64%
2	65% and above

Appendix B

I. (b) Data Quality:

Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes Data

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2022 Indicator 3 Outcomes Data reported by your State. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2018 – FFY 2021 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C. For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using the publicly available data and a lower and upper scoring percentage was set 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for category a, and 2 standard deviations above and below the mean for categories b through e (numbers are shown as rounded for display purposes, and values are based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). In any case where the low scoring percentage set from 1 or 2 standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2022 data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State's data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a 0 for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomaly score of 0, 1, or 2 is based on the total points awarded.

Outcome A	Positive Social Relationships
Outcome B	Knowledge and Skills
Outcome C	Actions to Meet Needs

Category a	Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning
Category b	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
Category c	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
Category d	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
Category e	Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

Expected Range of Responses for Each Outcome and Category, FFY 2022

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-1SD	+1SD
Outcome A\Category a	1.57	3.26	-1.69	4.83
Outcome B\Category a	1.39	3	-1.6	4.39
Outcome C\Category a	1.26	2.6	-1.33	3.86

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-2SD	+2SD
Outcome A\ Category b	24.07	9.01	6.05	42.08
Outcome A\ Category c	20.96	13.11	-5.27	47.19
Outcome A\ Category d	26.97	9.61	7.74	46.2
Outcome A\ Category e	26.43	15.4	-4.37	57.23
Outcome B\ Category b	25.63	9.71	6.21	45.04
Outcome B\ Category c	29.44	12.56	4.32	54.57
Outcome B\ Category d	31.02	8.11	14.8	47.25
Outcome B\ Category e	12.51	8.23	-3.96	28.98
Outcome C\ Category b	20.98	8.89	3.19	38.76
Outcome C\ Category c	23.49	13.59	-3.68	50.66
Outcome C\ Category d	33.36	8.28	16.8	49.93
Outcome C\ Category e	20.91	15.22	-9.53	51.35

Data Anomalies Score	Total Points Received in All Progress Areas
0	0 through 9 points
1	10 through 12 points
2	13 through 15 points

Anomalies in Your State's Outcomes Data FFY 2022

Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP's Assessed in your State	66
---	----

Outcome A — Positive Social Relationships	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	0	24	14	12	16
Performance (%)	0.00%	36.36%	21.21%	18.18%	24.24%
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome B — Knowledge and Skills	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	0	30	15	12	9
Performance (%)	0.00%	45.45%	22.73%	18.18%	13.64%
Scores	1	0	1	1	1

Outcome C — Actions to Meet Needs	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	0	29	17	12	8
Performance (%)	0.00%	43.94%	25.76%	18.18%	12.12%
Scores	1	0	1	1	1

Outcome	Total Score
Outcome A	5
Outcome B	4
Outcome C	4
Outcomes A-C	13

Data Anomalies Score	2
----------------------	---

Appendix C

II. (a) Data Comparison:

Comparing Your State's 2022 Outcomes Data to Other States' 2022 Outcome Data

This score represents how your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2022 Outcomes Data. Your State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements for your State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States. The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement (values are based on data for States with a summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned 0, 1, or 2 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned 0 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned 1 point, and if your State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile the Summary Statement was assigned 2 points. The points were added up across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive a total number of points between 0 and 12, with 0 points indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were at or below the 10th percentile and 12 points indicating all 6 Summary Statements were at or above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of 0, 1, or 2 was based on the total points awarded.

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Scoring Percentages for the 10th and 90th Percentile for Each Outcome and Summary Statement, FFY 2022

Percentiles	Outcome A SS1	Outcome A SS2	Outcome B SS1	Outcome B SS2	Outcome C SS1	Outcome C SS2
10	45.63%	35.29%	54.05%	27.07%	51.93%	33.56%
90	82.58%	69.37%	81.10%	56.55%	85.30%	71.29%

Data Comparison Score	Total Points Received Across SS1 and SS2
0	0 through 4 points
1	5 through 8 points
2	9 through 12 points

Your State's Summary Statement Performance FFY 2022

Summary Statement (SS)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS1	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS2
Performance (%)	52.00%	42.42%	47.37%	31.82%	50.00%	30.30%
Points	1	1	0	1	0	0

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2(*)	3
------------------------------------	---

Your State's Data Comparison Score	0
------------------------------------	---

Appendix D

II. (b) Performance Change Over Time:

Comparing your State's FFY 2022 data to your State's FFY 2021 data

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year's reporting (FFY 2021) is compared to the current year (FFY 2022) using the test of proportional difference to determine whether there is a statistically significant (or meaningful) growth or decline in child achievement based upon a significance level of $p \leq .05$. The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase across the years. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas are totaled, resulting in a score from 0 – 12. The Overall Performance Change Score for this results element of '0', '1', or '2' for each State is based on the total points awarded. Where OSEP has approved a State's reestablishment of its Indicator C3 Outcome Area baseline data the State received a score of 'N/A' for this element.

Test of Proportional Difference Calculation Overview

The summary statement percentages from the previous year's reporting were compared to the current year using an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon a significance level of $p \leq .05$. The statistical test has several steps. All values are shown as rounded for display purposes.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2022 and FFY 2021 summary statements.

e.g., C3A FFY2022% - C3A FFY2021% = Difference in proportions

Step 2: Compute the standard error of the difference in proportions using the following formula which takes into account the value of the summary statement from both years and the number of children that the summary statement is based on

$\text{Sqrt}[(\text{FFY2021\%} * (1-\text{FFY2021\%})) / \text{FFY2021N} + (\text{FFY2022\%} * (1-\text{FFY2022\%})) / \text{FFY2022N}] = \text{Standard Error of Difference in Proportions}$

Step 3: The difference in proportions is then divided by the standard error of the difference to compute a z score.

Difference in proportions /standard error of the difference in proportions = z score

Step 4: The statistical significance of the z score is located within a table and the p value is determined.

Step 5: The difference in proportions is coded as statistically significant if the p value is less than or equal to .05.

Step 6: Information about the statistical significance of the change and the direction of the change are combined to arrive at a score for the summary statement using the following criteria

0 = statistically significant decrease from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

1 = No statistically significant change

2= statistically significant increase from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

Step 7: The score for each summary statement and outcome is summed to create a total score with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 12. The score for the test of proportional difference is assigned a score for the Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score based on the following cut points:

Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score	Cut Points for Change Over Time in Summary Statements Total Score
0	Lowest score through 3
1	4 through 7
2	8 through highest

Summary Statement/ Child Outcome	FFY 2021 N	FFY 2021 Summary Statement (%)	FFY 2022 N	FFY 2022 Summary Statement (%)	Difference between Percentages (%)	Std Error	z value	p-value	p<=.05	Score: 0 = significant decrease; 1 = no significant change; 2 = significant increase
SS1/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	38	55.26%	50	52.00%	-3.26	0.1072	-0.3043	0.7609	NO	1
SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	40	60.00%	57	47.37%	-12.63	0.1019	-1.2402	0.2149	NO	1
SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	38	55.26%	58	50.00%	-5.26	0.1040	-0.5061	0.6128	NO	1
SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	48	39.58%	66	42.42%	2.84	0.0932	0.3049	0.7605	NO	1
SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	48	33.33%	66	31.82%	-1.52	0.0890	-0.1703	0.8648	NO	1
SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	48	43.75%	66	30.30%	-13.45	0.0913	-1.4736	0.1406	NO	1

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2	6
---------------------------------	---

Your State's Performance Change Score	1
---------------------------------------	---

Data Rubric

Guam

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part C Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8A	1	1
8B	1	1
8C	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	13
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	18

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/Settings Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	9
Grand Total (Subtotal X 2) =	18.00

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	18
B. 618 Grand Total	18.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	36.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	36.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 2 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 2.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part C 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits counts/ responses for an entire EMAFS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part C Child Count and Setting	Part C Child Count and Settings in EMAFS	8/30/2023
Part C Exiting	Part C Exiting Collection in EMAFS	2/21/2024
Part C Dispute Resolution	Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAFS	11/15/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all data elements, subtotals, totals as well as responses to all questions associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection. See the EMAFS User Guide for each of the Part C 618 Data Collections for a list of edit checks (available at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html>).

Dispute Resolution**IDEA Part C****Guam****Year 2022-23**

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	0
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	0
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance.	0
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines.	0
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines.	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	0
(2.1) Mediations held.	0
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations not held.	0

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	0
Has your state adopted Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(1) or Part B due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(2)?	PARTB
(3.1) Resolution meetings (applicable ONLY for states using Part B due process hearing procedures).	0
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline.	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Hearings pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	0

State Comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Guam

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>