

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

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Guam**



**PART C DUE  
February 1, 2022**

**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 2020. 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 new SPP with new targets and the APR to the public are provided separately within this introduction section of Guam's FFY2020 SPP/APR.

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

### General Supervision System

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

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.

#### Technical Assistance System:

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

GDOE has a technical assistance system and 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, training, and support is 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), and through the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (CEDDERS).

During this COVID-19 pandemic, TA support for the guidance and clarification on the GEIS IFSP Quality Rubric was provided through Dr. Naomi Younggren through ECTA, and with the TA support from Guam CEDDERS, via virtual sessions with the GEIS service providers and service coordinators to collectively complete the IFSP Rubric. Dr. Younggren also provided additional follow up sessions on Reviewing and Infusing COS Processes and Practices into the IFSP process.

As a result, improvements were made to the IFSP forms to capture important information on the present levels of development organized by the three childhood outcome areas to include age anchoring statements and how it can help the entire IFSP team with the Child Outcome Summary (COS) rating determination using the decision tree.

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 assessed through 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 evidenced-based practices. The Program uses other ways such as, the review of data compiled from the training evaluations, observations, and feedback from parents, service providers, Guam Early Learning Council (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 days are designated specifically to 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 reports on a quarterly basis to the Guam's Early Learning Council (GELC) which presents all early childhood serving agencies. GEIS continues to partner and collaborate with all early childhood serving agencies in planning for professional development activities. Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) continues to be an excellent collaborator in supporting shared professional development activities. Some of these activities, include but not limited to, Parent Café, Strengthening Families/Protective Factors Framework, the Learn The Signs: 4 Key Steps for Early Identification, and other GELC early childhood initiatives. Other collaborative technical assistance and professional development was provided through partnership with the Kariñu: Guam's Early Childhood System of Care, the Guam Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) Project, and the Preschool Development Grant (PDG) Birth to Five project.

GEIS continues to provide more focus training in to build confidence and competences and to ensure these strategies that support a child's expressive language are implemented to its fidelity. These training sessions 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 by ensuring that the quality components of intervention visits are documented. GEIS continues to monitor these strategies through the review of the Early Intervention Coaching (FLARE) plans, observations, and data collection fidelity checks.

In addition, GEIS continues to provide parent interactive sessions on evidence-based strategies at support a child's expressive language skills. The focus of these interactive sessions is to provide opportunities for parents to apply these strategies and share with other families. In addition, Service Providers shares the different tools and resources when working with infants and toddlers and their families during regular scheduled home visiting sessions.

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2020 - 2025 SPP/APR/SSIP. This was given to members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant birth-5 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. GEIS reported on each indicator, measurement, program progress and/or slippage of trend data. In addition, performance indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 for FFY 2020 were presented to all stakeholders that were in attendance.

GEIS staff and in collaboration with the GICC developed a plan of ways to send information to parents requesting them to attend these sessions, as parents have lived experience in receiving early intervention services and supports from GEIS. Through these discussion, GEIS staff recommended that the Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on the Part C State Performance Plan be broken down into 3 Cluster groups. These Cluster groups included – 1) Child Find and Public Awareness - Cluster 1 included information pertaining to indicators 5 and 6; 2) Natural Environments and Child Outcomes– Cluster 2 included indicators 2 and 3; and 3) SSIP - Cluster 3: State Systemic Improvement Plan (indicator 11) and reviewed indicators 3 and 4. In additions, the GEIS held 2 large Stakeholder Meetings to review all other performance indicators as well the compliance indicators (1, 7, and 8). At each virtual input session and review the new requirements, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations during these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are members of the GICC, the Guam Early Learning Council (ELC) members, and the GEIS SSIP Core Leadership team.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, each virtual input session reviewed the IDEA requirement including the new requirements of ensuring parent participation, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations. During these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings the Stakeholders discussed the purpose of the meeting and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Why is data that way; 2) What improvement activities will improve outcomes; 3) recommendation for target settings; and 4) evaluating the process. Upon reviewing how the stakeholder were to participate, the facilitator for the session then asked Stakeholders to commit to the process and to shared how they may engage in the conversation. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are 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 how important it was for their present and participation at this meeting and that their input will set the course for the next six years.

The sessions were scheduled on the following dates and noting several sessions were held on Saturdays for parents and community partners that had requested:

- Cluster 1: Child Find and Public Awareness were held on September 22 and October 13, 2021. At these sessions there were a total of six parents, seven GICC members, fifteen GEIS staff and fourteen community partners of stakeholders who attended.
- Cluster 2: Natural Environments and Child Outcomes were held September 23 and October 12, 2021. Overall attendance included ten parents, six GICC members, twelve GEIS staff, and ten community partners.
- Cluster 3: SSIP sessions were held on October 4 and December 13, 2021. Overall attendance included six GICC members, twenty-one GEIS staff, and seven community partners that were in attendance.
- Large Stakeholder Meeting was held on Dec. 16, 2021. At this session stakeholders reviewed Indicators 1, 7 & 4. Present at this meeting was one parent, three GICC members, four staff, and three community partners totaling eleven stakeholders who attended.
- 2nd Large Stakeholder Meeting was held on January 8, 2022, and the following Indicators were reviewed: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11. There were six parents, one GICC member, four GEIS staff, and one community partner totaling twelve stakeholders who attended.

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

NO

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

23

#### **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.**

As noted earlier, invitations were sent to the GICC members including parent members, parents of children enrolled in GEIS, and Community partners that included other early childhood programs. In addition to the invitations, flyers, emails, and phone call reminders were sent to the parents 2 weeks and then one week prior to the event. At each virtual session, Stakeholders were provided information of the agenda and how we would like them to engage in the process. These processes included providing a description of State Performance Plan, and an explanation of how stakeholders involvement will support the development of performance targets and the development and implementation of the SSIP. With the TA support from the Guam CEDDERS, a PowerPoint presentation included an explanation of the State Performance Plan (SPP), how it is designed to evaluate Guam's efforts to implement the IDEA requirements and purposes, how Guam will improve the implementation which will include measurable and rigorous targets for indicators established under the priority areas.

The presentation also included how Guam will report on the number of parent members participated and how parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council/State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents will be engaging in setting targets for performance indicators, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating the progress.

During the cluster sessions and Large Stakeholders meetings, Stakeholders were engaged by reviewing and analyzing the program's trend data that was provided during the sessions. For some sessions, parents and other stakeholders ask for additional data be broken down and asked for data providing input and recommendations. Input from each virtual sessions were presented at the Larger Stakeholder meetings that included possible on the reasons for the performance, recommendation for improvement strategies, and considerations for target setting. Information received are documented in the narrative for each indicator.

#### **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.**

GEIS facilitated the following activities to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to participate in the virtual stakeholder input sessions. These sessions were scheduled at different times and dates to allow parents to attend when it is most convenient for them. The sessions were scheduled to include multiple dates in order to allow diverse groups of parents to participate. The sessions focused discussions on how virtual home visiting services were provided during the COVID pandemic. Some parents shared that virtual home visits seemed to work better using the coaching model through Tele-Intervention. Prior to the virtual sessions, GEIS sent out flyers to all parents with a follow-up call to confirm receipt of the flyers. The week prior to the sessions, parents received another call from the Service Coordinators/Service Providers encouraging parents to attend. During the sessions, the facilitator presented the agenda and anticipated outcomes of the virtual session and asked each parent to commit to engaging in the discussion topics. Based on the commitment made by the parents, the small group discussions were engaging and parents were actively involved in sharing their input on 1) why the data is like that; 2) what recommendations would help improve the services, and 3) provided input towards setting targets for each performance indicator.

In addition to making available input sessions at different times and dates, the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) initiated the authentic engagement approach to developing and implementing family learning opportunities. In October 2020, GDOE received a 5-year OSEP State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG), Hita Para Mo'na (HPM), which, in CHamoru, means "moving forward together." Through the Leading by Convening (LbC) framework, Project HPM's authentic engagement approach invites and facilitates outreach to families to ensure the reach will address improving functional outcomes and educational results for children with disabilities, with a focus on children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) across the age-groups. The authentic engagement approach brings all stakeholders together to identify current family and professional learning practices during the COVID-19 pandemic impact on services, and how the system can support meaningful and effective family and professional learning practices, especially during these uncertain times.

During this reporting period, Project HPM established key local, regional, and national partnerships: the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), Guam's Autism Community Together (ACT), and the University of Guam (UOG) CEDDERS and School of Education. NASDSE brings to the project the LbC framework to ensure authentic engagement by all stakeholders, beginning with parents and providers of our young children receiving early intervention services. NASDSE continues to facilitate LbC virtual and on-site sessions for families and providers of young children to come together to determine the what, why, and how learning opportunities can be meaningful for families and providers to improve outcomes for children receiving early intervention services. ACT and UOG provide the local relevancy of LbC within Guam's island community and the local support for sustainability. It is anticipated that through this multi-year project, authentic engagement will be sustained to ensure increased capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development and implementation of family and professional learning activities designed to improve outcomes for our young children receiving early intervention services.

#### **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 flyer Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan were shared during a quarterly meeting for the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council, and the Guam Early Learning Council. The flyer was also shared during the GELC Leadership Committee meetings for the Preschool Development Grant on activities and shared with members of Project Minetgot: Guam Territorial Team, which is a one-year project designed to strengthen Guam's early childhood programs. The flyer was also shared to 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 target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

GEIS will include the SPP/APR 2020-2025 reports (to include 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>

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

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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 revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

The GEIS will report annually to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the submission of the FFY 2020 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 in 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 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised Guam of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Guam to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Guam to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. Guam must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

### **Intro - OSEP Response**

Guam's 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 the State lead agency'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 2020 and 2021 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 22, 2021 determination letter informed Guam that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance. Guam provided the required information.

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on Guam's FFY 2020 and FFY 2021 IDEA Part C grant awards.

### **Intro - Required Actions**

Guam's IDEA Part C determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In Guam's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Guam received assistance; and (2) the actions Guam took as a result of that technical assistance.

## 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 noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	98.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.15%	95.56%	95.68%	96.00%	96.83%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
73	84	96.83%	100%	96.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**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.*

8

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

There were three (3) children with delays in timely services:

Child #1: Timely home visit was not completed within 30 days from consent by parent on the initial IFSP in early June. The Primary Service Provider (PSP) left the program and resulted in a new PSP to be assigned to this family. This caused delays in timely services. The new PSP made contact with family 30 days after the required timeline. Family informed the new PSP that they were leaving island the following week. The family indicated that they may not be returning to the island in time any services to be provided by GEIS. The child turns 36 months in February 2022.

Child #2: Timely home visit was not completed within 30 days from consent by parent on the Initial IFSP. The child was 34 months by the time of the initial IFSP. The PSP did not schedule his visits within required timeline. Attempts were made to schedule, but the child exited the program at 36 months of age, and began services under the Part B.

Child # 3: Timely home visit was not completed with 30 days from consent by parent on the Initial IFSP. The PSP did not schedule his visits within the required timeline. The PSP left the program and not provide documentation for reason for the delay.

The PSP for these three children resigned from the program.

**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 as to 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, 2020 to June 30, 2021

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

GEIS performance for this reporting period is 81/84 or 96.43%. Seventy-three (73) infants and toddlers received timely services on their IFSPs, eight (8) with had documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances, and three (3) were not timely due to program delays.

The actual data for 2020-2021, 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.

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

GEIS lost 6 out of 10 primary service providers in the program: one re-located off-island, three were assigned to DPHSS to support with the COVID-19 quarantine process and the COVID hotline, one resigned, and one transferred to work in a classroom. In addition, families were still uncomfortable with face to face meetings or visits made by our GEIS staff, which resulted in numerous cancellations of meetings/sessions. GEIS has All positions have been filled as of October 2021.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 2019, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that, it 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 the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

### Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) did not issue a written notification of findings of noncompliance for the noncompliance reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 1 substantial compliance data of 96.83% (61/63). The two untimely services reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 1 data were part of the subsequent data reviewed for the FFY 2018 findings of noncompliance. As reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 1 Data section, these two untimely services occurred in January 2020 and March 2020, with one exiting the program and one corrected six days after the required commencement date.

As reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 1, the CMO verified that the GEIS demonstrated timely correction of the Indicator 1 timely services noncompliance identified in FFY 2018. Verification included a review of the program data reports that showed the corrected individual instances of noncompliance and subsequent data at 100% compliance. The subsequent data at 100% compliance was reported to occur in the months of April 2020 and May 2020, which were within the one-year correction period in FFY 2019.

## 1 - OSEP Response

### 1 - Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. Specifically, Guam must report that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within its jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.



## 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target>=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.30%	99.36%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	99.36%	98.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	100.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2020 - 2025 SPP/APR/SSIP. This was given to members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant birth-5 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. GEIS reported on each indicator, measurement, program progress and/or slippage of trend data. In addition, performance indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 for FFY 2020 were presented to all stakeholders that were in attendance.

GEIS staff and in collaboration with the GICC developed a plan of ways to send information to parents requesting them to attend these sessions, as parents have lived experience in receiving early intervention services and supports from GEIS. Through these discussion, GEIS staff recommended that the Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on the Part C State Performance Plan be broken down into 3 Cluster groups. These Cluster groups included – 1) Child Find and Public Awareness - Cluster 1 included information pertaining to indicators 5 and 6; 2) Natural Environments and Child Outcomes– Cluster 2 included indicators 2 and 3; and 3) SSIP - Cluster 3: State Systemic Improvement Plan (indicator 11) and reviewed indicators 3 and 4. In additions, the GEIS held 2 large Stakeholder Meetings to review all other performance indicators as well the compliance indicators (1, 7, and 8).

There were a total of 38 stakeholders that attended two cluster meetings schedules on September 23 and October 12, 2021. The Stakeholders that were in attendances comprised of 10 parents, 6 GICC members 12 GEIS staff, and 10 Community partners. The focus for Cluster 2 virtual session was on indicator 2: Natural Environments and indicator 3: Child Outcomes.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, each virtual input session reviewed the IDEA requirement including the new requirements of ensuring parent participation, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations. During these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings the Stakeholders discussed the purpose of the meeting and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Why is data that way; 2) What improvement activities will improve outcomes; 3) recommendation for target settings; and 4) evaluating the process. Upon reviewing how they stakeholder were to participate, the facilitator for the session then asked Stakeholders to commit to the process and to shared how they may engage in the conversation. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are 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 how important it was for their present and participation at this meeting and that their input will set the course for the next six years.

**STAKEHOLDER INPUT:**

- Stakeholders discussed the definition of natural environment, and it was shared that during the pandemic, it was considered that because some families were not comfortable with people going into their homes, that the service providers or the team do things out in open areas, such as the family's backyard, or at a park. Some families are challenge with transportation to the park, so that's another consideration.
- Stakeholders also shared that for some parents, virtual works better using the coaching model through Tele-intervention.

**STAKEHOLDER JUSTIFICATION:**

During the virtual input session, stakeholders were provided information on what is meant by natural environments and how children learn in settings that they are familiar and part of their daily routine. Next, information on trend data was presented and stakeholders reviewed the baseline data from the FFY 2005 was at 100%. Stakeholders discussed in great detail and recommended that Guam change the baseline to 99.36% which would be appropriate since our average performance for the past several years have been between 95-98%.

**STAKEHOLDERS RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:**

Provide training for the new EI staff and parents on natural learning environments and provide an info graph on what are natural environments. Due to the concerns with COVID-19, continue to provide families the option of virtual home visiting until families are comfortable, or plan with families when visits can happen in other natural environments.

**TARGET SETTING:**

Stakeholders noted that there was progress by .64% from FFY 2019 to FFY 2020, with the performance above national average of 98%. The baseline is 100% in 2013 and the baseline was met 5 out of 8 years. Although GEIS continues to show high performance for each year, in comparison to the national average, Stakeholders recommended to set the target at 99.36% for FFY 2020, and work towards gradual increase to 100%. Stakeholders agreed to the targets indicated.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	141
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	141

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
141	141	99.36%	99.36%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**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**

##### **STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:**

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2020 - 2025 SPP/APR. This was given to members of the GICC, Preschool Development Grant birth-5 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. GEIS reported on each indicator, measurement, program progress and/or slippage of trend data. In addition, performance of indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 for FFY 2020 were presented to all stakeholders that were in attendance.

There were a total of 38 stakeholders that attended two cluster meetings schedules on September 23 and October 12, 2021. The Stakeholders that were in attendances comprised of 10 parents, 6 GICC members 12 GEIS staff, and 10 Community partners. The focus for Cluster 2 was to review indicators 2 - Natural Environments and indicator 3: Child Outcomes.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, each virtual input session reviewed the IDEA requirement including the new requirements of ensuring parent participation, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations. During these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings the Stakeholders discussed the purpose of the meeting and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Why is data that way; 2) What improvement activities will improve outcomes; 3) recommendation for target settings; and 4) evaluating the process. Upon reviewing how they stakeholder were to participate, the facilitator for the session then asked Stakeholders to commit to the process and to shared how they may engage in the conversation. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are members of the GICC, the GELC members, community partners, and the GEIS SSIP Core Leadership team. At each session, Stakeholders were acknowledged how important it was for their present and participation at this meeting and that their input will set the course for the next six years.

##### **STAKEHOLDERS INPUT:**

- Stakeholders noted that in prior years there was some steady improvements then the COVID pandemic hit, possibility affecting their social and emotional development. Some families lost their jobs, families were displaced and making EI service not a priority, but instead basic living needs. Stakeholders also noted that some families either were not computer savvy, did not have access to internet or did not have the resources.
- The Program Coordinator shared that the challenges the program faced: The loss of 6 out of 10 primary service providers in the program which had an impact on the program: one (1) re-located off-island, three (3) were assigned to DPHSS to support with the COVID-19 quarantine process, and the COVID hotline as, one (1) resigned, and one (1) transferred to work in a classroom. In addition, families were still uncomfortable with have visits made by our GEIS staff, which resulted in numerous cancellations of meetings/sessions. The Program Coordinator also shared that all positions have been filled as of October 2021. Six new staff who are being provided training with the TA support from CEDDERS.

##### **STAKEHOLDER JUSTIFICATION:**

For Indicator 3A, 3B and 3C, Stakeholders noted in prior years there were some areas of improvement prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. During the pandemic they noted were families that lost their jobs, EI services were not a priority to them, but rather living needs were the main priority. It was noted that some families did not have access to internet, and not computer savvy. Some families not have the resources or no access due to lack of resources and knowledge on technology. Stakeholders also shared that in-person with COVID protocols in place (with the practice of social distancing and use of PPEs) and virtual home visiting can continue as options for families. The Program Coordinator shared the challenge of keeping staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. Stakeholders notes across the board consistent slippage on all indicators, and question what if the strategies shared virtually, work for some families.

##### **STAKEHOLDERS RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:**

- Continue training on the EC Coaching with staff and parents
- Support training for parents to enhance skill to support overall child development,
- Continue to offer families the option of virtual or in-person services, with COVID protocols in place.
- Provide professional development on the IFSP and in embedding the outcome goals into the IFSP
- Provide training on Online Parenting Curriculum (Birth-8 years) that provides short videos sent to families, with weekly emails
- Work with families to recruit siblings to help in the intervention, with the agreement between service providers and family
- Ensure the access to technology equipment (i.e., iPad, MiFi) for those who chose virtual services

##### **TARGET SETTING:**

Stakeholders discussed how the pandemic affects the future targets. Suggestions were made: to take the average percentage from the years and use the average it to identify the initial target percentage, to gradually increase by 3% to 5%, start with the current performance and increase by 3% until we meet the national trend. Stakeholders also discussed with the GEIS staff if these targets would be achievable and realistic. Stakeholders reviewed the options recommended changing the baseline and agreed to the following baselines for 3A, 3B & 3C for SS1 and SS2:

3A1: Stakeholders reviewed the overall average of 49.7% for the past 8 years with the range 45% to 60.38%, and national average of 63% (FFY 2018). Stakeholders noted the FFY 2013 baseline of 58.28% and that GEIS met the baseline one year in FFY 2019-2020. Stakeholders recommended change to the baseline from 58.82% from 2013 to 36.17% for the new SPP.

3A2: Stakeholders reviewed the overall average of 57.61% for the past 8 years with the range 55.17%, to 66.25%, and the national average of 56%. Stakeholders noted the FFY 2013 baseline of 66.25% and that GEIS did not meet baseline performance for the past 8 years. Stakeholders recommended to change the baseline from 45.59% for the new SPP.

3B1: Stakeholders reviewed the overall average of 54.30% for the past 8 years with the range of 46.30% to 64.41%, and the national average of 71%. Stakeholders noted the FFY 2013 baseline of 64.41% and that GEIS did not meet the baseline performance for the past 8 years. After some discussion,

stakeholders recommended to change the baseline from the FFY 2013 at 64.41% to 46.30% for the new SPP.

3B2: Stakeholders reviewed the overall average of 48% for the past 8 years with the range: 40.58% to 53.85%, and the national average of 47%. Stakeholders noted the FFY 2013 baseline of 53.78% and that GEIS met the baseline performance in FFY 2015. (just one year). Stakeholders recommended to change the baseline from the FFY 2013 at 53.78% to 39.71% for the new SPP.

3C1: Stakeholders reviewed the overall average of 49.8 % for the past 8 years with the range of 36.17% to 58.62%, and the national average of 70%. Stakeholders recommended to change the FFY 2013 baseline from 58.62% to 46% for the new SPP.

3C2: Stakeholders reviewed the overall average of 55.70% for the past 8 years with the range at: 47.83 to 60%, and the national average of 58%. Stakeholders noted the FFY 2013 baseline of 60% and GEIS met the baseline performance only once on 2015-2016. Stakeholders recommended to change the FFY 2013 baseline from 60% to 47.06% for the new SPP

**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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2020	Target>=	62.50%	65.50%	68.00%	70.00%	66.00%
A1	36.17%	Data	46.81%	45.45%	47.92%	56.86%	60.38%
A1 AR		Target>=	62.50%		68.00%	70.00%	
A1 AR		Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	
A2	2020	Target>=	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	66.30%
A2	45.59%	Data	63.74%	59.09%	55.17%	56.10%	55.84%
A2 AR		Target>=	67.50%		74.00%	76.00%	
A2 AR		Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	
B1	2020	Target>=	67.50%	70.50%	73.00%	75.00%	65.50%
B1	46.30%	Data	53.57%	55.36%	45.76%	58.18%	60.34%
B1 AR		Target>=	67.50%		73.00%	75.00%	
B1 AR		Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	
B2	2020	Target>=	57.50%	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	54.00%
B2	39.71%	Data	53.85%	50.00%	44.83%	48.78%	42.86%
B2 AR	2006	Target>=	57.50%		62.00%	64.00%	
B2 AR		Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	
C1	2020	Target>=	63.50%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%	59.00%
C1	46.00%	Data	51.02%	48.15%	36.17%	50.00%	55.17%
C1 AR	2006	Target>=	63.50%		68.00%	70.00%	
C1 AR		Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	
C2	2020	Target>=	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%	61.00%
C2	47.06%	Data	64.84%	56.82%	54.02%	50.00%	55.84%
C2 AR	2006	Target>=	64.00%		68.00%	70.00%	
C2 AR		Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	36.17%	40.59%	45.01%	49.43%	53.85%	58.28%
A1 AR						
Target A2 >=	45.59%	50.25%	54.32%	58.29%	62.26%	66.50%
A2 AR						

Target B1 >=	46.30%	49.90%	53.50%	57.10%	60.70%	64.50%
B1 AR						
Target B2 >=	39.71%	43.22%	45.86%	48.50%	51.14%	53.78%
B2 AR						
Target C1 >=	46.00%	48.52%	51.04%	53.56%	56.08%	58.62%
C1 AR						
Target C2 >=	47.06%	50.26%	52.69%	55.12%	57.55%	60.00%
C2 AR						

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

68

##### 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	30	44.12%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7	10.29%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	14.71%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	21	30.88%

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	8	100.00%

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	17	47	60.38%	36.17%	36.17%	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	31	68	55.84%	45.59%	45.59%	N/A	N/A

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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				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	8	8			100.00%	N/A	N/A

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

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
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	42.65%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12	17.65%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	13	19.12%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	14	20.59%

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
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	12.50%
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	7	87.50%

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	25	54	60.34%	46.30%	46.30%	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	27	68	42.86%	39.71%	39.71%	N/A	N/A

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	0	1			0.00%	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	7	8			87.50%	N/A	N/A

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

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
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	27	39.71%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	9	13.24%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	14	20.59%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	18	26.47%

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
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	12.50%
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	7	87.50%

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	23	50	55.17%	46.00%	46.00%	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	32	68	55.84%	47.06%	47.06%	N/A	N/A



Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	0	1			0.00%	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	7	8			87.50%	N/A	N/A

**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	68
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.	3

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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.

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.

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.

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 has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

**3 - Required Actions**

## 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 and 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2005	Target>=	95.50%	95.70%	96.00%	96.50%	98.00%
A	91.00%	Data	96.05%	96.83%	100.00%	94.87%	100.00%
B	2005	Target>=	90.50%	91.00%	92.00%	94.00%	98.00%
B	84.00%	Data	94.74%	98.41%	97.56%	97.44%	90.91%
C	2005	Target>=	95.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%	100.00%

C	79.00 %	Data	100.00%	98.41%	100.00%	100.00%	95.45%
---	---------	------	---------	--------	---------	---------	--------

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A>=	88.20%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%
Target B>=	94.10%	94.60%	95.10%	95.60%	96.10%	96.60%
Target C>=	94.10%	94.60%	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 Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2020 - 2025 SPP/APR/SSIP. This was given to members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant birth-5 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. GEIS reported on each indicator, measurement, program progress and/or slippage of trend data. In addition, performance indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 for FFY 2020 were presented to all stakeholders that were in attendance.

GEIS staff and in collaboration with the GICC developed a plan of ways to send information to parents requesting them to attend these sessions, as parents have lived experience in receiving early intervention services and supports from GEIS. Through these discussion, GEIS staff recommended that the Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on the Part C State Performance Plan be broken down into 3 Cluster groups. These Cluster groups included – 1) Child Find and Public Awareness - Cluster 1 included information pertaining to indicators 5 and 6; 2) Natural Environments and Child Outcomes– Cluster 2 included indicators 2 and 3; and 3) SSIP - Cluster 3: State Systemic Improvement Plan (indicator 11) and reviewed indicators 3 and 4. In additions, the GEIS held 2 large Stakeholder Meetings to review all other performance indicators as well the compliance indicators (1, 7, and 8).

There was a total of 23 stakeholders that attended two cluster meetings schedules on December 16, 2021, and January 8, 2022. The Stakeholders that were in attendances comprised of 7 parents, 4 GICC members, 8 GEIS staff, and 4 Community partners. The focus for to review indicator 1: Timely Services, Indicator 4: Family Outcomes, and Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, each virtual input session reviewed the IDEA requirement including the new requirements of ensuring parent participation, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations. During these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings the Stakeholders discussed the purpose of the meeting and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Why is data that way; 2) What improvement activities will improve outcomes; 3) recommendation for target settings; and 4) evaluating the process. Upon reviewing how the stakeholder were to participate, the facilitator for the session then asked Stakeholders to commit to the process and to shared how they may engage in the conversation. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are members of the GICC, the Guam Early Learning Council (ELC) members, Community partners, and the GEIS SSIP Core Leadership team. At each session, Stakeholders were acknowledged how important it was for their present and participation at this meeting and that their input will set the course for the next six years.

#### STAKEHOLDER INPUT:

Stakeholders reviewed trend data and asked how the surveys were disseminated. GEIS shared that the survey methods were mainly hardcopies prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

- Stakeholders indicated that the best way to do it is to integrate it within the IFSP process (explaining the survey at the end of the IFSP meeting) . Although there was still caution because parents may not feel comfortable completing the survey in front of the service providers. The Program Coordinators shared that the survey methods prior to COVID was mainly hardcopies, but for this reporting period it was mainly digital sent via emails.

#### STAKEHOLDERS RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:

- Stakeholders recommended to consider different options, such as integrating the survey within the IFSP process, and translate the survey into other languages.
- Stakeholders agree that hard copies should continue as an option and sending follow-up letters to complete the survey. Another recommendation was to have the survey completed during an interview (face-to-face) and with someone to explain the questions to parents. This would especially help parents with English as a second language.

#### TARGET SETTING:

Stakeholders agreed to the following target settings:

For Indicator 4A, Stakeholders agreed to keep the current baseline of 91%, however, to increase targets by 1% each year, starting with the FFY 2020; 88.20% then move up to 89%, 90%, 91%, 92% and 93% for FFY2025.

For Indicator 4B, Stakeholders agreed to keep the baseline to 84%, however, to increase targets by .5%, each year: 94.10%, 94.60%, 95.25%, 96.10% and 96.60% for FFY 2025.

For Indicator 4C, Stakeholders agreed to keep the baseline of 79%, however, to increase targets by .5% each year: 94.10%, 94.60%, 95.10%, 96.10% and 96.60% for FFY 2025.

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	100
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	17
Survey Response Rate	17.00%

A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	15
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	17
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	16
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	17
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	16
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	17

Measure	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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%	88.20%	88.24%	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)	90.91%	94.10%	94.12%	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)	95.45%	94.10%	94.12%	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
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

#### Survey Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Survey Response Rate	15.38%	17.00%

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

GEIS will assess different options that will support the dissemination and completion of the surveys by revising the standard operating procedure for disseminating, collecting, and reporting. GEIS has in place a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process to monitor and make changes based on data results in the procedures or data collection process.

**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.**

Of the 100 families to whom surveys were distributed, only 17/100 (17%) were returned.

During the last reporting period, and for this reporting period, the GEIS Program had experienced a low return rate of parent surveys due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. For this indicator, there were 17 out of 100 or (17%) families of infants and toddlers enrolled in the program that completed and returned the survey to the Program. For this reporting period, surveys were sent our families via email. Surveys were not mailed out to families for this reporting. The emails sent to families included a link to the survey to complete. In reviewing the low response rates for the last two years, the low rate may be contributed to the challenging and stressful times for families. Although the families were reminded to complete the surveys sent to them by clicking on the link attached, this may have been challenging for families (who may not have the understand where to go to get to the survey).

The low return rate also be attributed to the program's data clerk being out on medical leave. The data clerk is responsible in preparing the surveys for dissemination. The surveys were sent home on a seal envelope, to include a return stamped envelope address to the program. The data clerk also was responsible tracking the surveys that were returned. For this reporting period, this data clerk continues to be on sick leave.

**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.**

GEIS conducted an analysis of the demographics to determine whether the FFY 2020 survey response group was representative of the population served. A review by ethnicity revealed that the respondents were generally representative of the majority of the ethnic groups of the population of families that received the survey when examining breakdown by ethnicity.

Although there were 17 parents that completed the survey, based on the analysis, there were 8 or 47% of Chamorro ethnicity; 6 or 35 % of Chamorro mix; 2 or 12 % of Filipino, and 1 or 6% from other Pacific Islanders. The breakdown of ethnicities represents the demographics of children enrolled in Guam Early Intervention System.

**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).**

A review by geographic location also indicated that the respondents represents of a majority of the villages where the majority of infants and toddlers served reside. Representation of the survey results represented families living at the different regions of the island: 10 or 59 % were families in the central part of Guam; 2 or 12% from the northern villages; and 5 or 29% were from families living in the southern villages.

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

#### **4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **4 - OSEP Response**

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

#### **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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	1.35%	1.40%	1.50%	1.55%	1.31%
Data	1.65%	0.99%	0.86%	1.13%	0.86%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	0.95%	1.00%	1.05%	1.10%	1.13%	1.15%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2020 - 2025 SPP/APR/SSIP. This was given to members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant birth-5 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. GEIS reported on each indicator, measurement, program progress and/or slippage of trend data. In addition, performance indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 for FFY 2020 were presented to all stakeholders that were in attendance.

GEIS staff and in collaboration with the GICC developed a plan of ways to send information to parents requesting them to attend these sessions, as parents have lived experience in receiving early intervention services and supports from GEIS. Through these discussion, GEIS staff recommended that the Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on the Part C State Performance Plan be broken down into 3 Cluster groups. These Cluster groups included – 1) Child Find and Public Awareness - Cluster 1 included information pertaining to indicators 5 and 6; 2) Natural Environments and Child Outcomes– Cluster 2 included indicators 2 and 3; and 3) SSIP - Cluster 3: State Systemic Improvement Plan (indicator 11) and reviewed indicators 3 and 4. In additions, the GEIS held 2 large Stakeholder Meetings to review all other performance indicators as well the compliance indicators (1, 7, and 8).

There was a total of 42 stakeholders that attended two cluster meetings schedules on September 22 and October 13, 2021. The Stakeholders that were in attendances comprised of 6 parents, 7 GICC members, 15 GEIS staff, and 14 Community partners. The focus was to review indicator 5: Birth to 1 Served and Indicator 6: Birth to 3 Served.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, each virtual input session reviewed the IDEA requirement including the new requirements of ensuring parent participation, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations. During these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings, the Stakeholders discussed the purpose of the meeting and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Why is the data that way; 2) What improvement activities will improve outcomes; 3) recommendation for target settings; and 4) evaluating the process. Upon reviewing how the stakeholders were to participate, the facilitator for the session then asked Stakeholders to commit to the process and to shared how they may engage in the conversation. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are members of the GICC, the Guam Early Learning Council (ELC) members, Community partners, and the GEIS SSIP Core Leadership team. At each session, Stakeholders were acknowledged how important it was for their present and participation at this meeting and that their input will set the course for the next six years.

#### STAKEHOLDER INPUT:

- Stakeholders discussed that GEIS will continue to use the 2010 Census Population data since the 2020 Census Population data has not been disseminated. Stakeholders also reviewed data based on birth rates per year.
- At the first input session held, Stakeholders requested additional data on # of children served and # of services received and not received.
- Stakeholders shared that families that are homeless with children under three years or referred by CPS should be given training on strategies.

#### STAKEHOLDERS RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:

Stakeholder also recommended:

- Training for CPS and families that are homeless with children under 3 years and making referrals using the ASQ screen tools.
- To conduct more outreach fairs, use social media (like Facebook or Instagram), distribute program brochures by other EC partnering agencies. Use GEIS website, Village Mayors Office to share the information, do outreach to the 'hard-to-reach' areas in the neighborhood on the Power of Play. Support an Early Intervention Awareness Month.
- Use the CQI process to look at the referral process, promotional items to share information on the program, work with physicians to talk about developmental milestones at prenatal care, (OB/GYN, at Lamaze classes)

#### TARGET SETTING:

Stakeholders initially discussed changing the baseline of 1.13% but noted there was improvement made in three of the 8 years of performance. Stakeholders also noted the range of performance of .83 to 1.43 Stakeholders recommended to keep the baseline at 1.13%.

Stakeholders shared two possible options for target setting: Option 1: Do the average of the top 3 (1.44 + 1.65 + 1.61)/3 from the past 5 years, keep the baseline from 2005, then increase by .05%. Option 2: Do the average of the 5 years. Gradually increase each year so that we can meet or exceed the national trend data on the 5th year. Stakeholders agreed to do option 1.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	28
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, 2010 to July 1, 2020	07/08/2021	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	2,917

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
28	2,917	0.86%	0.95%	0.96%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	1.90%	1.95%	2.00%	2.03%	2.03%
Data	2.15%	1.66%	1.31%	1.65%	1.81%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	1.61%	1.61%	1.63%	1.63%	1.65%	1.65%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

##### STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2020 - 2025 SPP/APR/SSIP. This was given to members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant birth-5 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. GEIS reported on each indicator, measurement, program progress and/or slippage of trend data. In addition, performance indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 for FFY 2020 were presented to all stakeholders that were in attendance.

GEIS staff and in collaboration with the GICC developed a plan of ways to send information to parents requesting them to attend these sessions, as parents have lived experience in receiving early intervention services and supports from GEIS. Through these discussion, GEIS staff recommended that the Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on the Part C State Performance Plan be broken down into 3 Cluster groups. These Cluster groups included – 1) Child Find and Public Awareness - Cluster 1 included information pertaining to indicators 5 and 6; 2) Natural Environments and Child Outcomes– Cluster 2 included indicators 2 and 3; and 3) SSIP - Cluster 3: State Systemic Improvement Plan (indicator 11) and reviewed indicators 3 and 4. In additions, the GEIS held 2 large Stakeholder Meetings to review all other performance indicators as well the compliance indicators (1, 7, and 8).

There was a total of 42 stakeholders that attended two cluster meetings schedules on September 22 and October 13, 2021. The Stakeholders that were in attendances comprised of 6 parents, 7 GICC members, 15 GEIS staff, and 14 Community partners. The focus was to review indicator 5: Birth to 1 Served and Indicator 6: Birth to 3 Served.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, each virtual input session reviewed the IDEA requirement including the new requirements of ensuring parent participation, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations. During these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings the Stakeholders discussed the purpose of the meeting and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Why is data that way; 2) What improvement activities will improve outcomes; 3) recommendation for target settings; and 4) evaluating the process. Upon reviewing how the stakeholders were to participate, the facilitator for the session then asked Stakeholders to commit to the process and to shared how they may engage in the conversation. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are members of the GICC, the Guam Early Learning Council (ELC) members, Community partners, and the GEIS SSIP Core Leadership team. At each session, Stakeholders were acknowledged how important it was for their present and participation at this meeting and that their input will set the course for the next six years.

#### STAKEHOLDER INPUT:

- Stakeholders discussed that GEIS will continue to you the 2010 Census Population data since the 2020 Census Population data has not been disseminated. Stakeholders also reviewed data based on birth rates per year.

- At the first input session held, Stakeholder requested additional data on # of children served and # of services received and not received.
- Stakeholders shared that families that are homeless with children under three years or referred by CPS should be given training on strategies.

#### STAKEHOLDERS RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:

Stakeholder also recommended:

- Training for CPS and families that are homeless with children under 3 years and making referrals using the ASQ screen tools
- To conduct more outreach fairs, use social media (like Facebook or Instagram), distribute program brochures by other EC partnering agencies. Use GEIS website, Village Mayors Office to share the information, do outreach to the 'hard-to-reach' areas in the neighborhood on the Power of Play. Support an Early Intervention Awareness Month.
- Use the CQI process to look at the referral process, promotional items to share information on the program, work with physicians to talk about developmental milestones at prenatal care, (OBGYN, at Lamaze classes)

#### TARGET SETTING:

Stakeholders reviewed performances in previous year with the baseline in 2005: 1.56%, noting progress to the baseline performance in 3 of 8 years and with the range of performance between 1.13% to 2.15%.

Stakeholders agreed to keep the baseline at 1.56% and set targets to increase every other year, to meet or exceed the national trend data on the 5th year.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	141
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, 2010 to July 1, 2020	07/08/2021	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	8,690

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
141	8,690	1.81%	1.61%	1.62%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

#### 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 6 - OSEP Response

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

#### 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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.21%	98.08%	97.41%	96.90%	97.98%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
36	98	97.98%	100%	94.90%	Did not meet target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

Of the 98 infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted, 36 were held within the 45-day timeline, 57 had documented delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances due to the global pandemic, and five eligible infants had their IFSP conducted after the 45-day timeline due to program delays.

Guam did not meet the 100% compliance for this indicator and reported 94.90% (93/98) for this compliance indicator.

The five (5) eligible infants that had their initial IFSP conducted after the 45 day timeline due to program delays were for the following reasons:

Child #1: The Program delay was due to the program only having three "seasoned" primary service providers to support teams consisting of six new primary service providers who needed to learn the program's processes regarding assessments, interviews with families, participating in the development of the IFSP and facilitating home visits using early childhood coaching process with families. This resulted in challenges with schedules for the three primary services providers, which also had to ensure their cases were not effected. This resulted in this child's IFSP being completed 20 days late beyond the 45 day timeline.

Child #2: The Program delay was due to the program only having three "seasoned" primary service providers to support teams consisting of six new primary service providers who needed to learn the program's processes regarding assessments, interviews with families, participating in the development of the IFSP and facilitating home visits using early childhood coaching process with families. This resulted in challenges with schedules for the three primary services providers, which also had to ensure their cases were not effected. This resulted in this child's IFSP being completed 39 days late beyond the 45 day timeline.

Child #3: The Program delay was due to the program only having three "seasoned" primary service providers to support teams consisting of six new primary service providers who needed to learn the program's processes regarding assessments, interviews with families, participating in the development of the IFSP and facilitating home visits using early childhood coaching process with families. This resulted in challenges with schedules for the three primary services providers, which also had to ensure their cases were not effected. This resulted in this child's IFSP being completed 19 days late beyond the 45 day timeline.

Child #4: The Program delay was due to the program only having three "seasoned" primary service providers to support teams consisting of six new primary service providers who needed to learn the program's processes regarding assessments, interviews with families, participating in the development of the IFSP and facilitating home visits using early childhood coaching process with families. This resulted in challenges with schedules for the three primary services providers, which also had to ensure their cases were not effected. This resulted in this child's IFSP being completed 43 days late beyond the 45 day timeline.

Child #5: An oversight by the service coordinator to schedule the intake with families resulted in a delay in scheduling the meeting. The IFSP was completed 74 days after the 45-day timeline, resulting in a program delay.

All GEIS Service Coordinators staff with their IFSP teams monthly to discuss the status of cases. Printouts of cases, which indicate the 45-day "flag" date, is 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. In addition, the Part C Program Coordinator will work with the staff and develop a continuous quality improvement (CQI) process to address the challenges in ensuring services are done timely.

The Program Coordinator will continue to look at the CQI process to help with program improvement strategies for this requirement and identifying where technical assistance is needed. Results are also reviewed during GEIS staff meetings to discuss strategies and action plans to ensure the program meets compliance.

The Program Coordinator will continue to review reports monthly and verify data via monthly staffing and, when necessary, conduct a file review to track progress or slippage. Results of the monthly reports are reviewed by the Program Coordinator with the service coordinator or the service provider and strategies and action plans are developed to ensure the program meets compliance.

#### **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.**

57

#### **Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

Of the 98 infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted, 36 were held within the 45-day timeline, 57 had documented delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances due to the global pandemic or parent delays, with five eligible infants had their IFSP conducted after the 45-day timeline due to program delays.

Of the fifty-seven (57) eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for who an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted over the 45 day-timeline were attributed to: families cancelling sessions or meetings (31), not comfortable with visits or assessments until the number of COVID positives are not as high (11), wanting to hold off services (4), No shows for sessions/meeting (4) no response to calls or written notifications (4), Locating family, no longer residing at address on file (1), connecting with bio-parents and foster parents to hold meeting (1) , and a family wanting to wait on services since baby was still in the hospital (1)

#### **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, 2020 to June 30, 2021.

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

Of the 98 infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted, 36 were held within the 45-day timeline, 57 had documented delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances due to the global pandemic, or parent delays, and 5 eligible infants had their IFSP conducted after the 45-day timeline due to program delays

All GEIS Service Coordinators staff with their IFSP teams monthly to discuss the status of cases. Printouts of cases, which indicate the 45-day "flag" date, is 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 the pandemic, GEIS lost 6 out of 10 primary service providers in the program: one re-located off-island, three were assigned to DPHSS to support with the COVID-19 quarantine process and the COVID hotline, one resigned, and one transferred to work in a classroom. In addition, families were still uncomfortable with have visits made by our GEIS staff, which resulted in numerous cancellations of meetings/sessions. All positions have been filled as of October 2021.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 2019, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that, it 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 the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) did not issue a written notification of findings of noncompliance for the noncompliance reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 7 substantial compliance data of 97.98% (95/99). As reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 7 Data section, the four 45-day timeline noncompliance included two that had documented delays attributed to exceptional family circumstances due to the global pandemic and two eligible infants who had their IFSP conducted after the 45-day timeline due to program delays. These FFY 2019 APR Indicator 7 noncompliance data were part of the subsequent data for the FFY 2018 Findings of noncompliance.

As reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 7, in June 2019, the CMO issued a written notification of noncompliance to the GEIS for the FFY 2018 APR Indicator 7 noncompliance. The written notification included a review of the corrected individual instances of noncompliance and subsequent data at 100% compliance in the FFY 2019 reporting period. Verified correction was confirmed by CMO at the end of the FFY 2019 period, within the one-year correction period.

## 7 - OSEP Response

### 7 - Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. Specifically, Guam must report that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within its jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## 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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$ .

B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	89.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.68%	100.00%
------	---------	---------	---------	--------	---------

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
54	79	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.

25

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

#### 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, 2020 to June 30, 2021

#### 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 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 the data accurately reflect 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, 100% (79/79) of the children had written documentation of completion of a 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. This data report was consistent with the 618 reported exit data of children with IFSPs.

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

There were a total of twenty-five (25) exceptional circumstances due to: parents were no show to meetings, parents cancelling meetings, refusing service, or requesting hold on services.

Stakeholders recommended to continue to provide ongoing training on transition and review the process since there are new staff on board.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$ .

B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	98.18%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
------	--------	---------	---------	---------	---------

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
40	40	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% (40/40) 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, 2020 to June 30, 2021

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

The LEA representative through the Part B Preschool Program was notified of toddlers receiving services under the GEIS program for 100% (40/40) 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).

Stakeholders recommended to continue to provide ongoing training on transition and review the process since there are new staff on board.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$ .

B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

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 noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	70.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	98.11%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.65%
------	--------	---------	---------	---------	--------

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
25	40	93.65%	100%	97.50%	Did not meet 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.

14

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

There was one (1) child whose transition conference did not occur at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine month prior to the child's third birthday. This was due to a program delay. The child's transition conference occurred at 34 months of age (15 days late) The was a due to the shortage of service providers available to meet the scheduled 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 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021

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

For Indicator 8C, there were Forty (40) that "exited" at the transition planning age with a referral to Part B and had a transition conference prior to their third birthday. Based on data, twenty-five (25) had their transition conference at least 90 days prior to their third birthday. There was one (1) not done timely due to program delay; this was due the shortage of staff and the scheduling with available service providers.

There were fourteen (14) exceptional circumstances

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).

Stakeholders noted progress from 90.77 for FFY 2019 to 97.50% or 6.73% improvement. Stakeholders recommended to continue to provide ongoing training on transition and review the process since there are new staff on board.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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 2019, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that, it 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 the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Guam must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

### Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The GDOE Compliance Monitoring Office (CMO) did not issue a written notification of findings of noncompliance for the noncompliance reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 8C compliance data of 93.65% (59/63). As reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 8C Data section, the four transition conference noncompliance were due to program delays; of which, one was corrected with the transition conference held when the child was 35 months of age and the other three were not held by the time the children exited the program.

The CMO reviews program data reports to identify noncompliance and verify correction of noncompliance. At the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period, the CMO reviewed the program data reports to identify 8C transition conference noncompliance. The four transition conference noncompliance reported in the FFY 2019 APR Indicator 8C were not in the program data reports because these children exited the program. All other transition conference requirements were met, which is the reason CMO did not issue a written notification of findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## 8C - OSEP Response

### 8C - Required Actions

Because Guam reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, Guam must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Guam must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. Specifically, Guam must report that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within its jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Guam did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## 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 ED Facts 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to the Guam Part C- Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stake Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to stakeholders to participate in order to attain input on the development of Guam's FFY 2020 SPP/APR. This was given to all Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC) members, Preschool Development Grant birth-5 (PDG) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS, and the GICC members. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council. GEIS - reported on program progress and/or slippage of its performance to our stakeholders who are service providers, who are members of the GICC, the Guam Early Learning Council (ELC), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Leadership team, and other parents during Parent Input sessions.

The Program shared that there were NO hearing requests that went to resolution sessions during this reporting period.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target>=					
Data					

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Target>=						
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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 2020. Guam is not required to meet its 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $[(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1] \text{ times } 100$ .

#### 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 targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to the Guam Part C- Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stake Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to stakeholders to participate in order to attain input on the development of Guam's FFY 2020 SPP/APR. This was given to all Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC) members, Preschool Development Grant birth-5 (PDG) leadership and workgroups, and parents of children in the GEIS, and the GICC members. The GICC members consist of parents, representatives of various agencies, and other programs identified by the council. GEIS - reported on program progress and/or slippage of its performance to our stakeholders who are service providers, who are members of the GICC, the Guam Early Learning Council (ELC), the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Leadership team, and other parents during Parent Input sessions. The Program shared that there were NO mediations during this reporting period.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target>=					
Data					

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=						

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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 meditations sessions were held. There were no meditations held during this reporting period.

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

Guam reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. 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 that must be 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., April 1, 2021). 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 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

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 (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., 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 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) 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)

YES

#### Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

Based on stakeholder input, GEIS continues to use the three broad improvement areas: Family supports, Professional Development and Local Practitioners. In preparation of the new SPP/APR, GEIS revised the Theory of Action that provided the Stakeholder with the chain (if, and then) of changes that will have to happen to achieve our SiMR outcomes. The following provides a brief description --

**Family Supports:** Family supports centers on linking families with community-based programs and parent support groups which focus on parenting skills, understanding child development, and sharing of strategies to address the child's needs. These supports enable families to have a stronger understanding of typical development, the importance of their role in supporting their child's development, and the available resources they can use to support their child's acquisition and use of knowledge and skills including early language and communication. Parents will participate in community-based parent support groups and learn more effective parenting strategies, which will result in an increase of positive parent and child interaction to help their children grow and learn. Parents will learn more effective parenting strategies. Parent/child interactions will increase in both quality and quantity to help their children grow and learn. GEIS will be able to identify the supports needed by the family

The TOA depicts the activities to update, implement, and track training that focuses on evidence-based strategies to support families in enhancing and improving their child's development in community-based programs and activities, for service providers and parents to identify IFSP goals related to parent participation in community-based programs to support families, and for parents to participate in community-based activities with other families.

- **Local Practitioner Supports:**

Early childhood community partners will have increased levels of understanding and confidence on early intervention services and supports. This will ensure strong collaborative partnerships with community partners and provide appropriate services that promote acquisition of knowledge and skills for their child. To achieve this, GEIS providers will collaborate with community partners to coordinate services for children and their families. This will entail understanding their roles, and how early intervention services will be delivered to promote their child's acquisition of knowledge and skills in early learning, language / communication and early literacy.

The TOA depicts the activities that facilitates collaborative engagement with EC agencies to ensure coordinated procedures and processes, for service providers to develop partnerships and be able to coordinate services in a standardized fashion, and for families to access and receive services available to them.

**Professional Development/Technical Assistance:** To build the capacity of early childhood providers by providing ongoing professional development opportunities in acquiring knowledge and skills, identifying and implementing to fidelity EBPs and use coaching and natural learning environment practices when planning and delivering early intervention services.

The TOA depicts the activities GEIS will continue to identify and/or develop and implement the professional development resources and mechanisms for ongoing support necessary to ensure early intervention service providers, including service coordinators, and contracted providers are adequately prepared to work with families and caregivers; For service providers have access to training when needed on evidence-based practices that promote children's acquisition of knowledge and skills; and For service providers to provide the most effective interventions and supports to children and families.

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

[https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/GEIS%20Theory%20of%20Action\\_508%20Compliant.pdf](https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/GEIS%20Theory%20of%20Action_508%20Compliant.pdf)

**Progress toward the SiMR**

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

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

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	46.30%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	46.30%	49.90%	53.50%	57.10%	60.70%	64.50%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Numerator: # of children who entered the program 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	Denominator: Total # of children who exited the program in Progress Categories a, b, c, and d in Outcome B, the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)					
		FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
25	54		46.30%	46.30%	N/A	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

GEIS continues to use the following data sources:

Indicator 3B1:

The Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)

Developmental Assessment for Young Children (DAYC2)

HELP Early Child Outcome Checklist

Parent Surveys

Observations

IFSP Outcomes

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

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.

As noted earlier, GEIS used items from the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP) strand that most closely relate to the SiMR in the area of expressive language to create the HELP ECO 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 HELP ECO Data is aggregated and a ECO HELP Summary Report is provided to the Program Coordinator for review.

**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 and the ECO HELP Data Report, GEIS connects the following data to provide a comprehensive report of not only child's performance, but in assess parents' levels of confidence and competence in supporting their child's

overall development with specific focus on expressive language. Another is assessing providers knowledge and skills in implementing GEIS models: 1) Early Childhood Coaching, 2) Routines Based-Intervention and 3) evidence-based practices to the fidelity. GEIS is currently in full implementation of these models.

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

**Child Assessment:**

1. Indicator 3 Child Outcome Measurement process
2. HELP ECO 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.
3. Tele-Intervention Parent Survey: Provides information of how tele-intervention is supporting their family in supporting their child and other areas of needs that the family may need, such as information on accessing health care, housing, food security, information of child development especially during these challenging times as a result of the COVID.

**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)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

During the last reporting period, and for this reporting period, the GEIS Program had experienced a low return rate of parent surveys due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. For this reporting period, surveys were sent our families via email. Surveys were not mailed out to families for this reporting. The emails sent to families included a link to the survey to complete. In reviewing the low response rates for the last two years, the low rate may be contributed to the challenging and stressful times for families. Although the families were reminded to complete the surveys sent to them by clicking on the link attached, this may have been challenging for families (who may not have the understand where to go to get to the survey).

The low return rate also be attributed to the program's data clerk being out on medical leave. The data clerk is responsible in preparing the surveys for dissemination . The surveys were sent home on a seal envelope, to include a return stamped envelope address to the program. The data clerk also was responsible tracking the surveys that were returned. For this reporting period, this data clerk continued to be on sick leave.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

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

YES

**If yes, please provide the following information: a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan; a rationale or justification for the changes; and, a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

Based on Stakeholder input and specifically with the discussion with the GEIS Core Leadership Team, it was recommended to update the SSIP Evaluation Plan based on the expansion of activities identified in the TOA and updated implementation plan. GEIS continues to use the logic model outcomes and related performance measures to guide the SSIP implementation and report to stakeholders. For the next five years, Guam's Department of Education - Part B Evaluation Team will work in collaboration with GEIS Core Team to update the data reports for the SSIP Evaluation Table Matrix. The Evaluation Matrix serves as the mechanism used to evaluation the eight (8) performance measures that includes a rating rubric for assessing and assigning a rating based on the data analysis results. Each rating has a corresponding set of criteria for what constitutes the score. The rating scale for each includes four options: 3 or STRONG PERFORMANCE; 2 or MODERATE PERFORMANCE; 1 = LOW PERFORMANCE; 0 = NOT ACCEPTABLE.

An additional rating of NOT YET RATED is included for performance measures where data has not yet been collected and reported. In the SSIP reporting each year, GEIS will use the scoring criteria to indicate their level of performance on each of the measures and use this information to apply resources to those areas in most need of support and for which improved performance is a priority.

The DOE-Part B Evaluation Team was provided the final SSIP Evaluation Worksheet Matrix Summary for review and verified the accuracy of the Evaluation Summary on January 31, 2022. The data collection plan includes evaluation activity, instrumentation/ analysis, and date of completion and performance rating.

The following link provides detail information of the Guam Part C SIMR Evaluation Plan:

[https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/GEIS%20SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan%20Table%20Matrix\\_508%20Compliant.pdf](https://www.gdoe.net/files/user/13/file/GEIS%20SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan%20Table%20Matrix_508%20Compliant.pdf)

**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 Strengthening Families Parent Café and parent curriculum). This aligns with the intended outcome to linkages with community-based programs (CBPs) and parent support groups that focus on sharing of strategies to address family and child needs

Families continue to have access to virtual home visiting (Tele-Intervention services) as an option for families to receive EI services, although some families still prefer to remain with tele-intervention services, some families are now allowing visits in other community setting or at home (in their back yard or under a canopy).

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD):**

GEIS continues to identify and/or develop and implement the professional development resources and mechanisms for ongoing support necessary to ensure early intervention service providers, including service coordinators, and contracted providers are 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; face-to-face; and develop methods to offer trainings asynchronously.
- Continuing the use training modules for EC that align with our EBP 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, Service Coordinator Training, etc.
- 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), from child identification to transition with community partners to coordinate services for children and families and to include strategies that promote early learning language/communication and early literacy strategies.

**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, CLC, 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.

##### Progress to date:

GEIS continues to use Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), from child identification to transition with community partners to coordinate services for children and families and to include strategies that promote early learning language/communication and early literacy strategies, work collaboratively in the GELC workgroups to define roles and responsibilities of different agencies to develop update the SOP

GEIS will continue to participate in collaborative activities with other EI partners, through the GELC workgroups to scale up the implementation of activities for Family Supports, Professional Development and Local Practitioner in order to support the SiMR.

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

Yes

In Fall 2021, the GEIS Data system upgrade began with support from Department of Public Health and Social Services – Preschool Development Grant (PDG) Birth to Five. Part of the initial grant was to expand the Child Link System under the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) to include additional data elements and data fields needed for the GEIS.

As of this reporting period, GEIS staff are actively involved by meeting with the data-based developer, the GEIS Data Manager and the Program Coordinator to review the system and provide provided their recommendations. The upgraded GEIS data System would allow IFSP teams to input data remotely and provide the teams access to data needed, in order to prepare for meetings or visits.

**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.**

#### DATA SYSTEM NEXT STEPS:

Once GEIS launches the new Child Link data system, will determine future upgrades to the data system that would allow IFSP teams to utilize web based IFSP forms during meetings with families.

--GEIS Program Coordinator and the GEIS Data Manager will finalize the plan with the developer, and pilot the data system, which will allow the service coordinators and primary service providers to access current information and update IFSP data virtually, and to update the SOP for submission of the IFSP documents, provide training to the GEIS staff on the SOP to ensure accurate and reliable data. The Program Coordinator will monitor and access the system for accurate and reliable data needed for stakeholder reporting and for the SPP/APR

#### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEXT STEPS:

-GEIS will continue to work with EC partners to expand the professional development SOP and develop a calendar of events to be shared with all EC partners.

-Provide PD for BOSSA staff, foster parents, and other EC partners on the referral to Initial IFSP process.

-GEIS will continue to provide as an option for parents to conduct home visiting via virtual or face to face or both, at the discretion of the families. With the support of Guam's Act Early Ambassador, new GEIS staff will receive PD training on the 4-key steps to support Parent Resilience,(from the CDC), and how to conduct Parent Cafes in order to strengthen families, especially during COVID.

-To update and revise a training plan, based on findings for all levels of EC program staff that includes training modules that align with self-assessment priorities that promote evidenced based practices in early learning language/communication and literacy. This would include distance tele-Intervention training for service providers on Coaching.

#### FAMILY SUPPORTS NEXT STEPS:

Develop and implement learning modules for families and EC the use of evidenced based parenting strategies that promote child development specifically on expressive language in natural learning environment

To develop, implement, and monitor parent engagement activities in community settings in conjunction with other early childhood serving agencies. (Such as Village Play Time, Library Story).

-Provide routine Virtual Parent Interactive Training Sessions to promote evidence-based practices in early learning, language/communication and literacy and other training to include parent training for parents in the IFSP process.

-GEIS will provide access to tablets and internet access to those families that do not have them available.

-GEIS will partner with other programs, to facilitate 'Parent Cafe's, using the Strengthening Families approach as a strategy to build family resiliency and to reduce child abuse especially during this COVID pandemic .

-GEIS to partner with other early childhood programs to increase the number of hosts for Parent Cafés, and to develop a calendar for virtual or in-person parent cafes.

#### LOCAL PRACTITIONER NEXT STEPS:

GEIS will continue to work with the ELC workgroup: Social Emotional Wellness/Multi-agency team (SEW-MAT) to support a system of care with wrap around service, by updating the SOP, and if needed, the referral process.



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

1. A Virtual Parent interactive session was held this reporting period: Babbles, Bubbles, and Boo...on "Pause and Wait" strategies to respond sensitively to your child's communication cues. EPBs are shared with families during these sessions.
2. GEIS will expand training for service providers on EBP's using the Teaching Strategies Gold (TSGold).
3. Early Childhood Coaching training was provided half of the GEIS staff. These are needed for the service providers new to the program.
4. Routine based interview training was also provided to staff that needed to complete their certification.
5. Training on the Early Start Denver Model: Family Coaching was provided to 4 GEIS service providers.
6. 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) EBP's 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.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.**

The Virtual Parent interactive session: Babbles, Bubbles, and Boo is an virtual activity to share EBP/strategies and to allow families to meet other parents and share how the strategies work for them.

Early Childhood Coaching: provides service provider strategies that would help them support the implementation of effective strategies for promoting early literacy, language, and communication that is aligned with Guam's State-identified Measurable Results (SiMR). This model is based on the premise that the parent-child relationship is the best path for developing early literacy, and communication by using the rich, natural resources of the home and daily routines.

To ensure that service providers are implementing the Early Childhood Coaching model to fidelity, GEIS staff continues to receive on and off-island training to include hands-on coaching, consultation and collaborative program planning, as well as follow up and review of the application of EBP practices. 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

**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.

**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.

**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.**

The Virtual Parent interactive session: Babbles, Bubbles, and Boo is an virtual activity to share EBP/strategies and will build trusting and respectful partnerships with the family through interactions that are sensitive and responsive to cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity. Practitioners support family functioning, promote family confidence and competence, and strengthen

Early Childhood Coaching: provides service provider strategies that would help them support the implementation of effective strategies for promoting early literacy, language, and communication that is aligned with Guam's State-identified Measurable Results (SiMR). This model is based on the premise that the parent-child relationship is the best path for developing early literacy, and communication by using the rich, natural resources of the home and daily routines.

To ensure that service providers are implementing the Early Childhood Coaching model to fidelity, GEIS staff continues to receive on and off-island training to include hands-on coaching,

consultation and collaborative program planning, as well as follow up and review of the application of EBP practices. 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

#### Routine-based Interviews RBI:

RBI is a needs assessments and is a 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.

#### 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.

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

The 2 major models identified to support Guam's SiMR are the following:

Early Childhood Coaching: Service Providers are observed, and data is collected using the following tools: 1. Case Tools: Family Centered Practices and Everyday Learning Opportunities; and 2) GEIS Early Childhood Coaching Fidelity Checklist.

RBI: Majority of the staff were trained and had received completion of training on the RBI and implementing the model to the fidelity. However, with the resignation of providers in the Summer of 2021, GEIS intends to work towards getting the new staff trained on RBI.

### **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.**

The following are based on the SSIP Evaluation Plan Summary that was reviewed and verified by the SSIP Evaluation Team by performance measures:

A1 Percent of parents report knowing about available community resources related to early learning language/communication and early literacy. The data collection for this measure 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. There are three (3) items from the Indicator 4 Annual Family Feedback Survey that are more closely related to the measure.

A1: Performance:

- Know about services in the community at 70.60%
- know where to go for support to meet my family's needs at 76.50%
- know where to go for support to meet my child's needs at 82.40%
- It was easy to find out about early intervention services that are available in the community at 92.9%.
- It was easy to get my child and family involved with early intervention services at 100%.
- GEIS has been helpful in connecting my child and family with other services or programs that can help us at 96.4%.
- I am comfortable asking for services and supports that my child and family needs at 100%.
- I know who to call if I have problems with the services and supports my child and family are receiving at 96.4%.
- I am comfortable asking for services and supports that my child and family needs at 92.9%

A1: Performance Rating: Overall performance: 89% or 2=Moderate 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 18 connections with agencies/ organization

A2: Rating for Performance: 1 = Low 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 =  $871.3 \text{ divide by } 9 \text{ (items)} =$

Overall average is 96.8%

A3: Rating of Performance

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

B: Performance: Pending Reports

B: Rating Performance: Not Yet Rated

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

C: Performance: Coordinated Activities = 20%; Integrated = 30% Overall Percentage: 50%

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:  $30/33 = 90.9\%$  of Administrators indicated adequate support

D: Rating Performance: 3=STRONG PERFORMANCE

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

E: Performance: 6 observations (with 2 checklists Family Centered Practices; and Everyday Child Learning Opportunities were completed) and the Guam EC Coaching Fidelity Checklist indicating: Overall performance was at 100% practices observed.

E: Rating Performance: 3=STRONG PERFORMANCE

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

F: Performance: Of the 64 children exiting, there were a total of 156 communication and cognitive goals.

Of which 63 were met and 78 emerging = 141.  $141/156 = 90.4\%$

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 54 infants and toddlers that exited, 25 reported substantially increased their rate of growth in the use of knowledge and skills in language and communication.  $25 / 54 = 46.3\%$

G: Rating Performance: 1=Low Performance

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

Professional Development for new staff on the following:

- The Virtual Parent interactive session: Babbles, Bubbles, and Boo is an virtual activity to share EBP/strategies will identify instruction that help a child become adaptive, competent, socially connected, and engaged, and promote positive adult-child interactions and instruction intentionally designed to promote child learning and development.

- Early Childhood Coaching: provides service provider strategies that would help them support the implementation of effective strategies for promoting early literacy, language, and communication that is aligned with Guam's State-identified Measurable Results (SiMR).

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.

The use of the FLARE during visits:

- To ensure that service providers are implementing the Early Childhood Coaching model to fidelity, GEIS staff continues to receive on and off-island training to include hands-on coaching, consultation and collaborative program planning, as well as follow up and review of the application of EBP practices

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.

**Describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in the previous submission 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.**

For each of the coherent strategies, the following are changes to the activities, strategies and timelines:

FAMILY SUPPORTS (FS):

FS1 Activity: Stakeholders agreed to expand the Family Survey to provide different options for completing the surveys.

- to develop standard operating procedures for disseminating, collecting, and reporting on Family Survey data, in order improve the return rate on the surveys to families beginning Fall 2021 through Spring 2022

- GEIS will provide training on the SOP to staff, and use the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) to monitor and make changes in the process beginning Spring and Summer 2022

FS2 Activity: GEIS will update and implement the parent training plan, to include the procedures how training needs can be shared in the IFSP process for families.

- GEIS plan to implement and monitor the effectiveness of the training plan using the CQI process, beginning Fall 2022 and quarterly as needed

FS3 Activity: GEIS will develop and implement learning modules through the use of evidenced based parenting strategies that promote child development specifically on expressive language in natural learning environments and develop a plan for parent interactive EBPs training modules using different formats and options to meet the parent's needs.

- Training on the parent interactive modules (to include EC Partners, providers, and parents) will be conducted. GEIS will evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of the parent trainings using the CQI Process and report the data and recommendations for improvements by Summer 2022 and on-going

FS 4 Activity: In collaboration, Guam Early Learning Council (GELC) Leadership Team, GEIS will develop, implement, and monitor parent engagement activities in community settings in conjunction with other agencies (Such as Village Play Time, Library Story Hour), and expand the process for community-based parent / family engagement activities such as Strengthening Families Parent Café and parent curriculum) beginning Fall 2021 and every quarter thereafter

FS 5 Activity: In collaboration with the GELC Public Awareness workgroup, GEIS will continue to assess parent needs using the GEIS teleintervention survey and develop and implement strategies to support the needs identified beginning Fall 2021 and quarterly.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:**

PD 1 Activity: GEIS will disseminate, 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. This will be shared with other early childhood serving agencies By March 2021 and annually thereafter.

PD 2 Activity: GEIS will update and revise a training plan, based on findings for all levels of EC program staff that includes training modules that align with self-assessment priorities that promote evidenced based practices in early learning language/communication and literacy Spring 2020 and annually thereafter.

- GEIS will collaborate with other early childhood program coordinators or serving agencies, analyze existing PD to include different available options such as virtual; face-to-face; and develop methods to offer trainings asynchronously, and based on that analysis, expand the training modules for EC that align with our EBP 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 with medical and mental health conditions, Service Coordinator Training, etc., By Spring 2020 and annually thereafter

- Develop procedures for implementing the training modules and align with professional development standards for new and current employees and update or revise EC PD Plan, and conduct training for EC program staff at all levels beginning October 2022.

#### LOCAL PRACTITIONERS:

In collaboration with the GELC agency representatives:

LP 1 Activity: GEIS will update and implement Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), from child identification to transition with community partners to coordinate services for children and families and to include strategies that promote early learning language/communication and early literacy strategies through a MOA. Fall 2021 and quarterly as needed

LP 2 Activity: GEIS will train EC staff on the updated SOP from child identification to transition and strategies to promote early learning language/communication and early literacy, and develop training modules/ packets and identify trainers with the EC staff by Beginning May 2022

GEIS will provide training on SOP to EC staff and physicians beginning summer 2022

- GEIS will evaluate and report the findings to the ICC and GELC Leadership on the training results and plan for sustaining beginning Fall 2022 and by-annually.

LP 3 Activity: GEIS will provide public awareness information and materials for parents reinforcing the importance of early years and strategies to enhance overall child development and specifically on expressive language skills within the child's daily routine Beginning Summer 2022 and by annually

- GEIS will work the GELC agency representatives to develop a public awareness plan for ensuring equitable access beginning summer 2022

- GEIS will implement and monitor the effectiveness of the public awareness and child find activities and materials such as Neni 311, Neni Directory Service; etc., Beginning Fall 2022

- Using the CQI process adapt if needed to improvement.

- Report updates and data on the public awareness activities beginning summer and bi-annually.

LP 4 Activity: GEIS will collaborate with other EC agencies to share strategies and processes for aligning services and supports. (e.g., IDBSS which includes 4 key steps for early identification, Neni 311, Neni directory of services) beginning Fall 2022

- create an inter-agency seminar twice a year - Annual and semi-annual -

- develop agenda - opportunities for program sharing strategies and processes across EC programs, and networking

- survey for potential topic areas - Yearly Themes

- support in the facilitation of the biannual seminars and report the findings and recommendations to next steps to the ICC and GELC.

In collaboration with GELC Leadership ,GEIS will develop and implement procedures with representatives (admin) from each agency, for a Coordinated Eligibility among early childhood programs and services by Spring 2022

- assess and review potential coordinated eligibility among agencies based on federal requirement. (i.e., CAPTA)

- Develop a process for coordinated eligibility

- Train programs on the process for coordinated eligibility and data collection protocol.

- Pilot and assess the implementation of the Coordinated Eligibility procedures.

- Report data on the number of children impacted to the ICC and GELC by spring 2023 and annually

GEIS will develop, implement, and monitor interagency agreement with EC program/agencies in supporting a system of care wrap around services for children experiencing extreme toxic stress and receive services from more than one agency using SEW-MAT processes by summer 2022.

- Using the procedures from the GELC Social Emotional Multiagency Team (SEW-MAT), train EC programs service providers on the SEW-MAT process. If adjustments are needed, the SEW-MAT will create a focus group to address the barriers or challenges identified.

- In collaboration with GELC: SEW Workgroup, implement. and monitor the process

- Report Data on the number of children participating in SEW-MAT to ICC and GELC by spring 2023 and annually.

## Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

### Description of Stakeholder Input

An invitation to attend the Guam Part C Guam Early Intervention System (GEIS) Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on Guam's Part C State Performance Plan was sent to parents, service providers, and community partners encouraging their participation in the development of Guam's FFY 2020 - 2025 SPP/APR/SSIP. This was given to members of the Guam Interagency Coordinating Council (GICC), Preschool Development Grant birth-5 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. GEIS reported on each indicator, measurement, program progress and/or slippage of trend data. In addition, performance indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 for FFY 2020 were presented to all stakeholders that were in attendance.

GEIS staff and in collaboration with the GICC developed a plan of ways to send information to parents requesting them to attend these sessions, as parents have lived experience in receiving early intervention services and supports from GEIS. Through these discussion, GEIS staff recommended that the Stakeholder Virtual Input Sessions on the Part C State Performance Plan be broken down into 3 Cluster groups. These Cluster groups included – 1) Child Find and Public Awareness - Cluster 1 included information pertaining to indicators 5 and 6; 2) Natural Environments and Child Outcomes– Cluster 2 included indicators 2 and 3; and 3) SSIP - Cluster 3: State Systemic Improvement Plan (indicator 11) and reviewed indicators 3 and 4. In additions, the GEIS held 2 large Stakeholder Meetings to review all other performance indicators as well the compliance indicators (1, 7, and 8).

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

#### STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:

There was a total of 34 stakeholders that attended three cluster meetings schedules on October 4, and December 13 & 16, 2021. The Stakeholders that were in attendances comprised of 1 parent, 9 GICC members 25 GEIS staff, and 10 Community partners. The focus for Cluster 3 virtual session was on indicator 11 SPP.

With technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS, each virtual input session reviewed the IDEA requirement including the new requirements of ensuring parent participation, current performance and to gather feedback and recommendations. During these cluster sessions and large stakeholders' meetings the Stakeholders discussed the purpose of the meeting and how each person present will be asked to provide input on the following: 1) Why is data that way; 2) What improvement activities will improve outcomes; 3) recommendation for target settings; and 4) evaluating the process. Upon reviewing how they stakeholder were to participate, the facilitator for the session then asked Stakeholders to commit to the process and to shared how they may engage in the conversation. Stakeholders that attended these virtual sessions included, parents, service providers, who are members of the GICC, the

Guam Early Learning Council (ELC) members, Community partners, and the GEIS SSIP Core Leadership team. At each session, Stakeholders were acknowledged how important it was for their present and participation at this meeting and that their input will set the course for the next six years. In addition, there were to GEIS Core Leadership sessions that were held on January 24 and 26, 2022. The purpose of these sessions were to gather finalize based on Stakeholder input the Theory Action, updated implementation plan and evaluation plan. There were a total of 15 GEIS staff that were in attendance at each meeting.

**STAKEHOLDER INPUT:**

- Stakeholders discussed the downward trend of indicator 3B SS1 and perhaps we need to focus on the secondary data point that will impact and improve performance of indicator 3B SS1.
- Stakeholders agreed to continue with the current SiMR with the focus on the show the secondary data point. Stakeholders recommended and agreed to keep the secondary data and also update the activities in the implementation plan.
- Moving forward, Stakeholders shared they want to see improvement, and with new people on board more is needed training.
- Stakeholders also agreed with both inputs and challenges families were experiencing however noted, there was improvement prior to COVID. Considering the COVID, generally at an upward Trend - Tele-working is more effective now. Families have the technology to participate.

**STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDED FOR IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES:**

- Stakeholders also recommend that the program will need to revise the Logic Model and implementation plan
- Stakeholder recommended with the COVID New Normal – need to adjust, how can we still provide contact with families and look at other options to be in place for families that have struggles.

**TARGET SETTING:**

Stakeholders discussed how the pandemic affects the future targets. Suggestions were made to take the average percentage from the years and use the average it to identify the initial target percentage, to gradually increase by 3% to 5%, start with the current performance and increase by 3% until we meet the national trend. Stakeholders also discussed with the GEIS staff if these targets would be achievable and realistic. Stakeholders reviewed the options recommended changing the baseline and agreed to the following baselines for 3B SS 1.

Stakeholders reviewed the overall average of 54.30% for the past 8 years with the range of 46.30% to 64.41%, and the national average of 71%. Stakeholders noted the FFY 2013 baseline of 64.41% and that GEIS did not meet the baseline performance for the past 8 years. After some discussion, stakeholders recommended to change the baseline from the FFY 2013 at 64.41% to 46.30% for the new SPP.

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

NO

**Additional Implementation Activities**

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

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

**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**

Guam has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Guam provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Guam provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps Guam has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## **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:

Thomas Babauta

#### Title:

Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

#### Email:

tcbabauta@gdoe.net

#### Phone:

(671)777-7732

#### Submitted on:

04/26/22 11:42:39 AM