

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B
for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education
Act

For reporting on
FFY 2023

American Samoa



PART B DUE February 3, 2025

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The executive summary includes a description of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for the next five years starting FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. A description of the technical assistance received, General supervision, the stakeholders engagement and the professional development system is reported separately following the executive summary in this introduction.

ASDOE SPED received technical assistance from National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and ongoing monthly webinars and conference calls. ASDOE leaders were also able to participate in OSEP-funded TA virtual conferences throughout SY 2023-2024.

American Samoa's General supervision system encompassing its technical assistance system, professional development system, stakeholder's involvement and public reporting is described in detail below.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

The SPED implements annual monitoring activities. These include a combination of regular monitoring team (MT) meetings with SPED staff who work directly with schools, off-site data collection and subsequent reviews, and on-site school visits. On-site visits consist of observations, interviews, and file review. SPED monitors all schools in the system: twenty-three elementary and six secondary public schools based on a cohort model. ASDOE's four-year monitoring cycle ensures that all schools are monitored through the review of student files and an onsite visit.

On average ASDOE monitors seven schools per year for targeted cyclical monitoring on a 4-year cycle (on-site school visits). The sample of schools identified for cyclical monitoring in a specific year is referred to as a cohort. Cohorts are organized based on geographic region: East, Central, Mid-West, Manu'a and West and the total number of students with disabilities served at the time the cohorts were developed. Cyclical monitoring ensures that the SPED MT monitors each school to examine compliance with federal special education requirements related to priority areas at least once every four years. This information is published in the ASDOE-SPED calendar which all staff and administrators receive. School visits and file reviews are conducted in the fall and spring of each year. Findings of noncompliance are coordinated with the APR data monitoring for review.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified compliance.

Prior to visiting the selected schools, the MT conducts a detailed review of a selected sample of student files. In order to determine the number of files selected as part of a sample for each school receiving an on-site visit, SPED has categorized the schools by size. Schools that have an enrollment of 500 or more are considered big schools, schools with an enrollment of at least 300 are medium schools and schools with an enrollment of less than 200 students are small schools. For the large and medium schools, the MT randomly selects 10 percent of the special education student files. For the smaller schools, the MT reviews all special education student files.

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

The MT convenes monthly meetings with SPED staff who work directly with schools. This approach enables the SPED MT to enforce SPED accountability while providing technical assistance to SPED teams before critical areas of the implementation of IDEA may become out of compliance. It is the SPED MT's approach that ensures staff meet program requirements of IDEA, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving education results for children with disabilities.

These meetings include ESs, Program Directors (PDs), Data Team (DT), and the SPED specialists who implement the most critical program requirements including the assessment coordinator (AC), the early childhood transition coordinator (ECC), and the post-secondary transition specialist (TS).

Data

The SPP/APR data are collected from several data systems. These includes SIS Powerschool Database, ASDOE monitoring database and trackers, parents surveys, preschool outcome surveys and student postschool outcome interviews.

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

ASDOE monitoring issues findings by the number of instances.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permits LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

ASDOE does not issue pre-findings.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

Monitoring programs for students with disabilities in AS is directly administered and supervised by the ASDOE Special Education Division Assistant Director with the assistance of Compliance Officer(s) consistent with the American Samoa Special Education General Supervision Manual. Under the authority of its Assistant Director, ASDOE Special Education Division monitors and enforces the implementation of services and programs for all students with disabilities in AS and annually reports on its results.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

Not Applicable

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

<https://www.amsamoadoe.com/divisions/specialeducation>

Technical Assistance System:

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

American Samoa has in place a revised general supervision, policies and procedures and a translation of the procedural safeguards from English to Samoan. Technical Assistance (TA) and training are critical for ensuring the implementation of IDEA requirements and assisting in identifying effective strategies to improve the performance and compliance of schools and programs.

ASDOE-SPED supports schools and programs and provides consultation and/or on-site IDEA procedural and program development technical assistance and training. ASDOE-SPED has a team of four Program Directors who are placed in the districts and oversee the SPED programs in the designated districts. They work directly with a group of Education Specialists and together they provide direct TA to schools. This team also includes a group of related service professionals.

Professional Development System:

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

ASDOE-SPED provides a professional development system that is directly linked to the SPP/APR, with emphasis on the SSIP, and monitoring activities to help schools and programs: 1) improve outcomes for students with disabilities; 2) improve the implementation of the requirements that are more closely related to the improvement of outcomes for student with disabilities.

The monitoring team, the data manager team, program directors, and SPED specialists meet monthly with the educational specialist to discuss progress on the implementation of the SSIP and other IDEA requirements. These meetings offer an opportunity for SPED staff to troubleshoot issues before they become problems. Also they are an opportunity for needs assessment at the school level and for delivery of professional development.

The compliance monitoring team provides technical assistance and training to help in the correction of noncompliance and improvement of performance. At the end of each school year, the compliance monitoring team determines which schools will receive an on-site visit the following school year. These on-site visits are part of the process of identifying non-compliance with specific areas as well follow-up visits to verify non-compliance have been corrected.

ASDOE-SPED Data Manager also has a schedule of training and TA for the school and classroom levels. Data collection requires the Education Specialists to meet every month. Technical Assistance in the school serves multiple functions to assist with improving educational results for children with disabilities

ASDOE-SPED is also committed in working hand in hand with its off-island agencies and partners to develop a professional development system to ensure that services for students with disabilities are being provided appropriately and provide opportunities for supporting teachers and administrators in improving these services when necessary.

Stakeholder Engagement:

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

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

5

Parent Members Engagement:

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

On January 30, 2025 the ASDOE held a meeting to solicit broad stakeholders input on the states targets in the SPP/APR and subsequent revisions American Samoa made to those targets. During this meeting ASDOE staff shared a PowerPoint presentation with data from all SPP/APR indicators. Stakeholders in teams reviewed the data for each indicator. Stakeholders had a chance to learn about Indicator 18, General Supervision.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

American Samoa (ASDOE) provides quarterly training for the parents at their child home school. Each school also provides additional trainings for the parents. The trainings cover the development of IEP goals and objectives so they can participate in the IEP meeting more meaningfully and can help their child outside of school.

During these training opportunities the parents share their feedback on the special education program. This also helps in improving the activities of the special education program to improve outcomes for children with disabilities

Soliciting Public Input:

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

American Samoa organizes annual meetings to present progress on the implementation of the SPP including the SSIP. American Samoa also receives feedback on its implementation of IDEA through participation in SEA-AC meetings. Finally, American Samoa receives feedback during all training session with parents.

Aside the interactive opportunities described above, American Samoa has a website (<https://www.amsamoadoe.com>) that is available to the public. Other mechanisms include advertisements in the newspaper, announcements on television and outreach programs gearing particularly for working parents. The public can reach us via email to provide specific input on evaluating our progress.

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.

American Samoa has a website (<https://www.amsamoadoe.com>) that is available to the public. On that site we publish the SPP/APR, the SSIP, Policies and procedure manual, general supervision manual, grants award application and assessments reports. Other mechanisms include advertisements in the newspaper, announcements on television and outreach programs gearing particularly for working parents. The public can reach us via email to provide specific input on evaluating our progress.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2022 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2022 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2022 APR in 2024, is available.

The FFY 2022 SPP/APR is found in the following link. <https://www.amsamoadoe.com/copy-of-grant-applications>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

American Samoa's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In American Samoa's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised American Samoa of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required American Samoa to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed American Samoa 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. American Samoa must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which American Samoa received assistance; and (2) the actions American Samoa took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

(1) the technical assistance sources from which American Samoa received assistance

In the past year, American Samoa received TA from the following OSEP funded centers: National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), IDEA Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSY), Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA), IDEA Data Center (IDC) and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR). NCSI hosts monthly webinars for the Pacific Entities, called Pacific Entities Learning Collaborative. On these webinars, we can interact with the other Pacific Entities, share and learn from each other, as well as hear presentations from TA providers from several centers, such as CIFR, IDC, NCII, NCIL, and Progress Center, among others. The NCSI TA facilitator is invited to attend American Samoa's monthly calls with our OSEP Team Lead, and coaches us on OSEP's directives, as a follow up from these monthly calls. American Samoa participates on NCSI's Learning Collaboratives, and attends meetings organized by NCSI, with a focus on the Results Based Accountability Systems (RBAS) collaborative. American Samoa attended the NCSI-organized Pacific Entities Learning Collaborative event, in October of 2024.

American Samoa continues to be a member of the National Association of Special Education Directors (NASDSE) association. The Special Education division has a representative in ASDOE's work with the Councils of Chiefs State School Officers (CCSSO) in Accountability and its effort in implementing change in its system. American Samoa receives TA from these organizations through webinars and conference calls.

In Fall of 2023 ASDOE received a visit from the Office for Special Education Programs. This was a monitoring and technical assistance visit.

(2) the actions American Samoa took as a result of that technical assistance

With new leadership in place for American Samoa Department of Education the Special Education Division has been able to meet to discuss ongoing programs that are being utilized in ASDOE. As a result of the TAs from the NCSI, it gave guidance in proposed activities for the new SSIP. American Samoa Department of Education Special Education Division (ASDOE SPED) is implementing a new reading program that is being piloted in all elementary schools. Teachers will be using data collection tools to assist with monitoring and tracking student results. The evidence-based model PDSA (Plan, Do, Study, Act) learned from NCSI will be used by the SSIP team to follow up on its proposed activities. Based on what we learned from the centers participating in the SSIP collaborative, the American Samoa SSIP core team will make some refinements to the SSIP activities. Overall with support from NCSI and the other centers the SSIP core team is looking at all schools in the Read Well and Language for Learning program.

The ECE program continues to work with DaSY and ECTA on awareness and ways to improve data collection for ECE students. Through the work with the TAs, American Samoa is also reviewing its policies and procedures to make sure it is aligned with IDEA. American Samoa continues to benefit from

ongoing TAs and continues to look forward to working with each center to improve results for students with disabilities.

As a result of the OSEP visit, the ASDOE team has started working on areas identified as areas for improvement during the exit interview. This includes fiscal management, integrated monitoring and child find procedures.

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	68.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Data	95.83%	81.82%	81.08%	81.63%	97.78%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	36
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
36	41	97.78%	87.00%	87.80%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

ASDOE does not have a state-defined alternate diploma.

In order to graduate with a regular diploma one must meet all requirements put forth by the American Samoa Department of Education. Students must obtain 20 credits provided that they pass all core courses:

- 4 years of English
- 3 years of Math
- 4 years of History
- 3 years of Science
- 1 Physical Education
- 1 Vocational Education
- 1 Samoan
- 3 Electives

The graduation requirements are the same for students with IEP's.

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	10.81%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	10.81%	10.70%	10.60%
Data	0.00%	2.93%	10.81%	6.12%	2.22%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	10.50%	10.40%	10.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	36
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
5	41	2.22%	10.50%	12.20%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The ASDOE Transition Coordinator works with all students in high school. The transition coordinator met with the school staff and the five students who dropped out. The students did not want to stay in school. They were in their senior year and two of them went from school to work on a competitive employment. Another one got married. The other two traveled off-island during the school year and upon returning decided not to continue their education. They are currently working and helping support their families. Every case is a specific case and the transition coordinator meets with students and school staff on a regular basis with the objective of improving transition plans and providing TA to schools and counseling to students. However, the ultimate decision for high school students such as those who were in their senior year and were of majority age is their own.

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

According to American Samoa's Department of Education - Student Services Division, drop out is when:

1. student was not enrolled on September 1st of the school year although was expected to be in membership (i.e. was not reported as a drop out the year before), and
2. has not graduated from high school or completed a state- district approved educational program
3. did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - * moved known to continue
 - * transfer to another public school district or private school
 - * recognized absence due to suspension or illness
 - * death
 - * graduated with a diploma/received a certificate
 - * or reached maximum age This applies to all students within the educational setting (except for special education students where maximum age is 21 and regular education students maximum age 18).

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 3	2020	82.61%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	93.75%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	90.91%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	80.56%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	91.67%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	97.44%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	92.00%	92.50%	93.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	97.44%	97.44%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	26	30	28
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	23	23	25
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	3	7	3

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	18	30	28
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	17	23	24
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1	6	3

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

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

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	26	26	68.18%	91.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	30	30	97.44%	94.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	28	28	84.00%	92.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18	18	77.50%	91.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	29	30	100.00%	93.00%	96.67%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	27	28	84.00%	97.44%	96.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The link provided below has the SBA results for FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 (from SY 2015-16 to SY 2023-24). The data was published by the American Samoa Center for Education and Workforce Statistics (ASCEWS) and from data submitted by the Integrated Data Services team. The data is for all students including students with disabilities. For FFY 2022 and FFY 2023, American Samoa did not submit nor published data disaggregated for non-disabled students, only for all students combined (students with and without disabilities combined)

<https://ascews-public.doe.as/PublicDashboard/dashboard/3579>

The FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 APR have the most detailed special education data that is made available to the public and it includes (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments (in the selected grades required for indicators 3A-D).

The FFY 2023 APR is posted on the following link:

<https://www.amsamoadoe.com/copy-of-grant-applications>

The FFY 2023 APR will be posted on this same link no longer than 30 days after the clarification week.

American Samoa FFY 2023 SPP/APR link: <https://www.amsamoadoe.com/copy-of-grant-applications>

Results of assessments can also be viewed at <https://ascews-public.doe.as/PublicDashboard/dashboard/4010> for all schools and all students.

Participation SWD SY 23-24 Link:

<https://www.amsamoadoe.com/copy-of-grant-applications>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of American Samoa's 2024 determination letter, American Samoa must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2022, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds American Samoa that in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, American Samoa must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2023.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 3	2020	11.11%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	23.26%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	0.00%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	3.85%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	7.14%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	0.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	12.50%	13.00%	13.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	23.60%	23.70%	23.80%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	1.50%	2.00%	2.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	8.50%	9.00%	9.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	1.50%	2.00%	2.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	23	23	25
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	3	1

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	17	23	24
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	1	0

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	1	23	9.09%	12.50%	4.35%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	3	23	9.68%	23.60%	13.04%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1	25	0.00%	1.50%	4.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Last year there was one student proficient out of 11 students with valid scores. This year there was one student proficient out of 23 students. There are no systemic issues that could explain the slippage. The ASDOE is implementing a K-3 literacy initiative, and although there were no improvements in the proficiency rate, there were improvements in the number of students moving from below basic to basic.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2	17	8.33%	6.00%	11.76%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1	23	0.00%	8.50%	4.35%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	24	0.00%	1.50%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The ASDOE publishes assessment data in two ways. First, for all students, ASDOE publishes a Territorial Report Card. In that report, link below, assessment data is reported for students with and without disabilities. The data for special education students is reported in the same format and frequency as the data for non-disabled students. However, these data charts do not report the types of tests students take (regular assessment with accommodations and without accommodations and alternate assessments). ASDOE submits that data via the Annual Performance Report (APR) and on a separate document, where special education students are reported with respect to the assessments they've taken.

Territorial Report Card Link: <https://www.amsamoadoe.com/offices/oasis/accountabilityreporting>

Special Education SPP/APR (and separate report on types of assessment taken) Link: <https://www.amsamoadoe.com/copy-of-grant-applications>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of American Samoa's 2024 determination letter, American Samoa must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2022, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds American Samoa that in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, American Samoa must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2023.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 3	2020	100.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	100.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	25.00%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	66.67%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	100.00%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	0.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	25.50%	26.00%	26.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	3	7	3
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	1	0

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1	6	3
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	1	0

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	0	3	50.00%	100.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	1	7	0.00%	100.00%	14.29%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	3	66.67%	25.50%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

American Samoa has less than 10 students participating on alternate assessment on grade 3. Last year 2 out of 4 students were proficient on grade 3 alternate assessments for reading and this year 0 out of 3. There are no systemic issues leading to this slippage. The students who took the alternate assessment in SY 2022-2023 and SY 2023 2024 are identified as students who have a significant cognitive disability that significantly impacts their ability to perform at grade level, even with accommodations and modifications.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

American Samoa has less than 10 students participating on alternate assessment on high school for reading. Last year 2 out of 3 students were proficient on high school alternate assessments for reading and this year 0 out of 3. There are no systemic issues leading to this slippage. The students who took the alternate assessment in SY 2022-2023 and SY 2023 2024 are identified as students who have a significant cognitive disability that significantly impacts their ability to perform at grade level, even with accommodations and modifications.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	1	14.29%	67.50%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	1	6	42.86%	100.00%	16.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	3	66.67%	25.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

American Samoa has less than 10 students participating on alternate assessment on grade 4. Last year 1 out of 7 students were proficient on grade 4 alternate assessments for math and this year 0 out of 1. There are no systemic issues leading to this slippage. The students who took the alternate assessment in SY 2022-2023 and SY 2023 2024 are identified as students who have a significant cognitive disability that significantly impacts their ability to perform at grade level, even with accommodations and modifications.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

American Samoa has less than 10 students participating on alternate assessment on grade 8. Last year 3 out of 7 students were proficient on grade 8 alternate assessments for math and this year 1 out of 6. There are no systemic issues leading to this slippage. The students who took the alternate assessment in SY 2022-2023 and SY 2023 2024 are identified as students who have a significant cognitive disability that significantly impacts their ability to perform at grade level, even with accommodations and modifications.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

American Samoa has less than 10 students participating on alternate assessment on high school for reading. Last year 2 out of 3 students were proficient on high school alternate assessments for math and this year 0 out of 3. There are no systemic issues leading to this slippage. The students who took the alternate assessment in SY 2022-2023 and SY 2023 2024 are identified as students who have a significant cognitive disability that significantly impacts their ability to perform at grade level, even with accommodations and modifications.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

The ASDOE publishes assessment data in two ways. First, for all students, ASDOE publishes a Territorial Report Card. In that report, link below, assessment data is reported for students with and without disabilities. The data for special education students is reported in the same format and frequency as the data for non-disabled students. However, these data charts do not report the types of tests students take (regular assessment with accommodations and without accommodations and alternate assessments). ASDOE submits that data via the Annual Performance Report (APR) and on a separate document, where special education students are reported with respect to the assessments they've taken.

Territorial Report Card Link: <https://www.amsamoadoe.com/offices/oasis/accountabilityreporting>

Special Education SPP/APR (and separate report on types of assessment taken) Link: <https://www.amsamoadoe.com/copy-of-grant-applications>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of American Samoa's 2024 determination letter, American Samoa must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2022, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds American Samoa that in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, American Samoa must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2023.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 3	2020	-6.07
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	15.69
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	20.02
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	9.15
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	2.87
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	2.03

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 3	0.00	0.00	0.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	15.55	15.50	15.40
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	19.00	18.75	18.50
Math	A <=	Grade 4	8.00	7.50	7.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	2.00	1.75	1.50
Math	C <=	Grade HS	2.00	2.00	2.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	587	629	747
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	23	23	25
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	25	301	131
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	3	1
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	3	1

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	541	627	550
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	17	23	24
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	51	54	5
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	1	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	1	0

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	4.35%	4.43%	-3.26	0.00	0.08	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	13.04%	48.33%	15.52	15.55	35.29	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.00%	17.67%	9.08	19.00	13.67	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Last year there was 1 student proficient out of 11 students with valid scores in grade 3. This year there was one student proficient out of 23 students. There are no systemic issues that could explain the slippage. The ASDOE is implementing a K-3 literacy initiative, and although there was not improvements on the proficiency rate, there was an improvement on the number of students moving from below basic to basic. Furthermore the gap moved from negative to 0.08 which indicates students with disabilities are performing very similar to all students on grade 3 reading assessments. Last year students with disabilities did better than students in the same grade level.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

There was an improvement on the proficiency rate for students with disabilities in Grade 8, from last year (9.68% proficient) to this year (13.04%). However, the improvements for all students proficiency rate for reading on Grade 8 had a larger improvement (from 25.20% to 48.33% proficient). There were no changes from the instruction model and literacy strategies from last year to this year. There were no changes in the instruction model and literacy strategies from last year to this year. There was a change in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (DCI) halfway through last year's School Year. ASDOE special education staff will follow up with the DCI to learn how special education students can best benefit from instruction when students are in the general education settings.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	11.76%	9.80%	1.46	8.00	-1.97	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4.35%	8.77%	8.61	2.00	4.42	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	0.00%	0.91%	0.91	2.00	0.91	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance. Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Definition of Significant Discrepancy in American Samoa:

Option 2 is selected and the measurement is based on the entire state because American Samoa doesn't have school districts.

American Samoa is a single school district. American Samoa examines data on suspension and expulsion rates to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Significant Discrepancy is when the rate (%) of children with IEPs suspended and expelled exceeds the rate (%) of non-disabled children suspended and expelled in a school year.

Methodology:

Number of children with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year (zero students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for SY 2022-23).

Number of non-disabled children suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year

Significant Discrepancy = _____ x 100 > _____ x 100

Total number of children with IEPs Total number of non-disabled children

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 data)

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

In FFY 2023 American Samoa did not report significant discrepancy and did not identify noncompliance. If in a subsequent year American Samoa identifies significant discrepancy the team will review its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. If the review of policies and procedures as described is related to the significant discrepancy the American Samoa monitoring team will issue a finding of noncompliance and will require the American Samoa Special Education Division to revise its policies, procedures, and practices accordingly.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

American Samoa is a single entity with a homogeneous population in terms of race/ethnicity. Virtually 100% of the population is composed of Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders.

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2020	Target >=	95.50%	95.50%	83.30%	83.50%	84.00%
A	83.30%	Data	94.26%	89.42%	83.30%	86.00%	82.38%
B	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	8.35%	8.30%	8.25%
B	8.35%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	8.35%	0.39%	0.00%
C	2020	Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%	0.40%	0.40%
C	0.40%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%
Target B <=	8.20%	8.15%	8.10%
Target C <=	0.40%	0.40%	0.35%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment	07/31/2024	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	482

Source	Date	Description	Data
Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)			
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	375
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	0

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

NO

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	375	482	82.38%	84.50%	77.80%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	29	482	0.00%	8.20%	6.02%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	482	0.00%	0.40%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
A	In FFY 2023, school year 2023-2024, there was an increase of the number of students in resource room and self-contained settings. These settings were determined by the IEP team. Special education team and school staff have been participating in ongoing training on IEP processes, development and implementation. As it happened last year, the ASDOE team believes this results in changes regarding decisions of what is the most appropriate Least Restrictive Environment for every student with a disability in American Samoa public schools.						

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

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

Part	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B	Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
C	Target <=			0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
C	Data			0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	100.00%
B	2020	0.00%
C	2020	0.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/31/2024

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	4	27	0	31
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4	27	0	31
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class				
b2. Number of children attending separate school				
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	0	0	0	0

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

NO

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	31	31	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	0	31	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	0	31	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A1	2020	Target >=	94.80%	94.80%	63.64%	64.10%	64.60%
A1	63.64%	Data	100.00%	80.00%	63.64%	60.00%	40.00%

A2	2020	Target >=	74.90%	74.90%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%
A2	71.40%	Data	91.67%	75.00%	77.27%	57.14%	33.33%
B1	2020	Target >=	76.20%	76.20%	76.70%	77.20%	77.70%
B1	72.70%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	76.92%	30.77%	50.00%
B2	2020	Target >=	58.60%	58.60%	59.10%	69.60%	70.10%
B2	55.10%	Data	91.67%	75.00%	68.18%	28.57%	16.67%
C1	2020	Target >=	76.20%	76.20%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%
C1	75.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	75.00%	46.15%	40.00%
C2	2020	Target >=	54.50%	54.50%	50.00%	50.50%	51.00%
C2	50.00%	Data	95.83%	75.00%	50.00%	21.43%	33.33%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	65.10%	65.60%	66.10%
Target A2 >=	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%
Target B1 >=	78.20%	78.70%	79.20%
Target B2 >=	70.60%	71.10%	71.60%
Target C1 >=	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%
Target C2 >=	51.50%	52.00%	52.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

10

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	2	20.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	10.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1	10.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	10.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	50.00%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A,	2	5	40.00%	65.10%	40.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	6	10	33.33%	76.50%	60.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	2	20.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	10.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1	10.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	10.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	50.00%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2	5	50.00%	78.20%	40.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	6	10	16.67%	70.60%	60.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	20.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1	10.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	10.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	60.00%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2	4	40.00%	76.50%	50.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	7	10	33.33%	51.50%	70.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B1	In FFY 2023 only 10 students met the minimum 6 month requirement and exited ECE program. Last year 6 students exited the program under the same criteria. We cannot establish a pattern to determine reasons for slippage or progress when we have such a small number of students being evaluated by these measures.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

American Samoa's assessment tool is Teaching Strategies GOLD Child Assessment Portfolio. It is used with individual children and the COS approach is used to complete the ratings. Stakeholders (Parents, ECE/Head Start Teachers, Part B Early Childhood Teachers) reviewed the quality of the COS's and the aggregate COS data. The Part B Early Childhood teachers complete the COS data. Then the Special Education Early Childhood Coordinator aggregates the data, summarizes it, present it to the stakeholders for a final check before submission.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	66.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%
Data	91.03%	84.35%	73.97%	93.21%	96.16%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
460	465	96.16%	89.50%	98.92%	Met target	No Slippage

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

ASDOE uses the same Parent Involvement Survey consisting of eight statements where participants respond whether they agree or not with each statement, for both parents of preschool and school age children. The ASDOE team distributes the same survey to all the schools and to all Early Childhood Education (ECE) centers. The educational specialists in these schools and centers collect the survey data from the parents using the same methodology. Parents of students aged 3 through 21 (preschool and school-age) are given the same opportunity to respond to the Parent Involvement Survey.

All public schools, and ECE centers provided parents with the opportunity to take the Parent Involvement Survey. All returned surveys from parents of students ages 3-21 are combined, processed, aggregated, and analyzed together. As mentioned before, ASDOE uses the same survey for parents of all grade levels, including parents of preschool children, which resulted in 465 surveys returned out of 514 surveys distributed, with a 90.47% response rate. Since the survey instrument and distribution methodology were identical for all age groups, the data for preschool and school-age surveys were combined and analyzed using the same procedures.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

514

Percentage of respondent parents

90.47%

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	80.19%	90.47%

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

ASDOE used the +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group to measure response rates and measure representativeness.

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

ASDOE used the Non Response Bias Analysis Application (NRBA App) to analyze the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. ASDOE analyzed representativeness with respect to two demographic groups: race/ethnicity and disability categories. Using the NRBA tool, the only group not representative was the disability category SLD, which was under-represented by 6.23 percentage points as indicated by the NRBA App. Comparing to last year's data, there was an improvement, considering last year the SLD population was under-represented by 20.72 percentage points.

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

NO

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

There was a considerable improvement on the response rate this year, when compared to last year (from 80.19% to 90.47%). The American Samoa team will continue to look at ways to improve the response rate for parents of students with disabilities. The parent coordinator will continue to work with schools to suggest ways in which schools can improve the number of parents responding to the survey, such as making the survey available at training events, school events, IEP meetings, and PTA meetings. The parent coordinator will also reach out to families of students with disabilities who do not traditionally participate in school activities. The parent coordinator will also coordinate visits for families with children with disabilities that are home based. The parent coordinator will also work with the educational specialist from each school to conduct training for parents in regards to the importance of completing the survey.

In terms of representativeness, there was also a significant improvement from last year, when SLD students were underrepresented by 20.72 percentage points, and this year 6.23 percentage points. The parent coordinator will continue implementing the strategies from SY 2023-2024, recommending the educational specialists in each school to help the parents complete the demographic section of the survey before they answer

questions or they take the survey home, considering that how parents respond to the demographic categories, as it happened last year, appears to be the main reason for the under-representativeness (parents entering a wrong disability category in their surveys, such as SLI instead of SLD).

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 strategies identified above, to improve survey representativeness, include activities that improve the survey response rate. The parent coordinator will work with schools to suggest ways in which schools can improve the number of parents responding to the survey, such as making the survey available at training events, school events, IEP meetings, and PTA meetings. The parent coordinator will also reach out to families of students with disabilities who do not traditionally participate in school activities. The parent coordinator will also coordinate visits for families with children with disabilities that are home based.

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

The ASDOE data team analyzed the representativeness of the survey respondents using the NRBA App. The ASDOE compared respondents to the target group, using two demographic variables (race/ethnicity and disability groups). The team identified underrepresentation of parents of SLD students.

To verify whether this underrepresentation of parents of SLD students would generate a nonresponse bias, the NRBA App compared outcomes across subgroups. The unweighted data, for indicator 8, indicated 98.92% of the responding parents with a child receiving special education services reported that schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children with disabilities. The average response from the underrepresented group indicated a 99.15% of the parents of a child with SLD receiving special education services reported that schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children with disabilities.

That is, if more parents of students with SLD responded to the survey, it is expected the overall Indicator 8 performance would increase towards the higher 99.15% result. This projected result would not impact ASDOE's performance for this indicator. It will continue to meet the target and will continue to exhibit progress when compared to last year.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

American Samoa is a single entity with a homogeneous population in terms of race/ethnicity. Almost 100% of the population is composed of Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders. The other race ethnicities are too small to meet minimum n and cell sizes.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

American Samoa is a single entity with a homogeneous population in terms of race/ethnicity. Almost 100% of the population is composed of Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders. The other race ethnicities are too small to meet minimum n and cell sizes.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	97.08%	95.61%	95.31%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
151	137	95.31%	100%	90.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

The reason for slippage are related to the change of management and organization structure for the school year 2023-2024. The ASDOE has a new assessment coordinator learning the procedural steps for the child find process. Also there was a change on the online related services provider. ASDOE moved from HelloHero to Tiny Eye. These changes impacted the implementation of the initial evaluation process.

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

14

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

The range of days went from 1 to 48 days late distributed as described below:

- 1 to 10 days: 4 cases
- 10 to 30 days: 7 cases
- Above 30 days: 3 cases

There are several reasons for the delays in the implementation of initial evaluations including the change of management and the change of service providers.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

American Samoa has a database (data tracker) for collecting child find data which includes data for the entire reporting year. American Samoa has an assessment team that consists of an assessment coordinator and assessment officers that use the database to record and document all cases of students referred for evaluation each year.

This data is collected on a monthly basis through monthly meetings and monthly reports, the data manager is responsible for this monthly collection. The data manager also analyzes the data and work with the assessment team to discuss reports of reliability and validity of child find data on a monthly basis. Moreover, the data manager collaborates with the compliance officers to monitor the child find data for implementing standard operating procedures to ensure compliance.

ASDOE-SPED Data Manager has a schedule of training and TA for the school and classroom levels. Data collection require the Educational Specialists to meet every month with the General Supervision Team that consists of the compliance officer, the transition specialist, parent coordinators, program directors, the assistant director, program coordinator, transportation coordinator and the assessment coordinator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The American Samoa Special Education monitoring team issued in FFY 2022 six findings of noncompliance to the American Samoa Special Education assessment team related to the six students (six individual instances) whose evaluation were completed beyond the sixty day timeline.

To verify that the American Samoa Special Education assessment team can demonstrate that it is correctly implementing this specific regulatory requirement, following the findings of noncompliance, the ASDOE monitoring team requested and reviewed three consecutive subsequent student evaluation files. These files were selected based on a pre-established criteria as described below:

Data Requirements for Demonstration of Subsequent Compliance, which is based on the instances of Noncompliance:

- 1-3 individual instances of non compliance: Two consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)
- 4-7 individual instances of non compliance: Three consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)
- 7-15 individual instances of non compliance: Four consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)

15+ individual instances of non compliance: Five consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)

These subsequent files must show 100% compliance with the specific requirement to demonstrate they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement.

Based on the review of these three subsequent files, which the monitoring team verified they were 100% compliant, and the verification of correction of the six individual instances of noncompliance (see below explanation on the verification of correction of the six individual cases), the Monitoring Team determined the FFY 2022 six findings of noncompliance were corrected.

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

American Samoa Special Education monitoring team asked the American Samoa Special Education assessment team to submit the evaluation reports of the 6 students that were noncompliant in FFY 2022. The American Samoa Special Education monitoring team verified that all six students (100% compliant) had completed evaluations although late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because American Samoa reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, American Samoa must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, American Samoa must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a system-wide data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, American Samoa must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If American Samoa did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why American Samoa did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	67.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	7
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	0
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	5
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2	2	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

American Samoa has a database for collecting Transitioning from Part C to Part B data (data tracker).

American Samoa has an Early Childhood Coordinator that collaboratively works with Part C and ECE Head Start by collecting data, tracking students transitioning from Part C to Part B, and coordinating the effort to make sure all these children have an IEP by their third birthday. The Early Childhood Coordinator uses the database to keep track of Part C to Part B student data and document all cases of students transitioning from Part C to Part B every year. This data is collected on a monthly basis through monthly reports and the data manager is responsible for this monthly collection. The data manager also analyzes the data and work with the Early Childhood Coordinator to share findings and discuss reports for reliability and compliance of Part C to Part B transitioning. The early childhood coordinator, the data manager, and the program director meet monthly to monitor progress on the implementation of early childhood transition. This is how we ensure no student will reach their third birthday without an IEP. The monitoring team participates on our monthly meetings and they collect transition data once a year for monitoring purposes.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

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 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	98.80%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	79.21%	98.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
153	153	98.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

The data for Indicator B13 in American Samoa reflects our use of the NSTTAC Indicator 13 checklist. On our file reviews we use the checklist as a scoring rubric sheet to score each item of the IEP and verify whether each IEP meets the minimum SPP/APR requirements. Here is a list of all the requirements considered:

1. Does the IEP include a measurable post secondary goal?
2. Is the postsecondary goal updated annually?
3. Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on age-appropriate transition assessment?
4. For each postsecondary goal, is there a type of instruction on, related services, community experiences, or development of employment and other post school objectives, and if appropriate acquisition on of daily living skill(s), and provision of a functional vocational evaluation listed in association with meeting the postsecondary goal?
5. Does the IEP/ transition plan include a course of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals?
6. Are there annual IEP goals that are related to the student's transition service needs?
7. Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed?
8. If appropriate, is there evidence that a representative of any participating Agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the Parent or student who has reached the age of majority?

Only when all 8 items are answered "YES" or "NA", we consider the IEP meets requirements. If one or more items were circled "NO" then the IEP does not meet requirements.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2		0

FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The American Samoa Special Education monitoring team issued in FFY 2022, 2 findings of noncompliance to the two high schools where noncompliance was identified. When the monitoring team applied the NTACT checklist, they identified 1 student in Nu'uuli Vocational Technical High School and 1 student in Samoana High School, whose transition plans did not meet at least one of the eight NTACT checklist items.

To verify that these two schools can demonstrate that it is correctly implementing this specific regulatory requirement, following the findings of noncompliance, in FFY 2023 the ASDOE monitoring team requested and reviewed 2 subsequent consecutive student files in Nu'uuli Vocational Technical High School and 2 subsequent consecutive student files in Samoana High School. These subsequent files were selected based on a pre-established criteria as described below:

Data Requirements for Demonstration of Subsequent Compliance, which is based on the instances of Noncompliance:

- 1-3 individual instances of non compliance: Two consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)
- 4-7 individual instances of non compliance: Three consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)
- 7-15 individual instances of non compliance: Four consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)
- 15+ individual instances of non compliance: Five consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)

These subsequent files showed 100% compliance with the specific requirement and with that they demonstrate they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement.

Based on the review of these subsequent consecutive files, which the monitoring team verified they were 100% compliant, the Monitoring Team determined the two schools (source of noncompliance) are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

In FFY 2023, the transition coordinator worked with the schools where these 2 students had noncompliance with their transition plans based on the NTACT Indicator 13 checklist. IEP meetings were convened and those 2 students and their parents were invited to the transition IEP meetings. All items on the NTACT checklist were verified as corrected.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because American Samoa reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, American Samoa must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, American Samoa must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a system-wide data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, American Samoa must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If American Samoa did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why American Samoa did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2024 on students who left school during 2022-2023, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2022-2023 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part-or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program. States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2020	Target >=	27.00%	28.00%	45.95%	46.50%	47.00%
A	10.81%	Data	12.50%	31.43%	10.81%	4.35%	2.22%
B	2020	Target >=	41.00%	41.00%	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%
B	45.95%	Data	50.00%	48.57%	45.95%	41.30%	37.78%
C	2009	Target >=	56.00%	57.00%	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%
C	48.00%	Data	100.00%	80.00%	100.00%	95.65%	51.11%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	47.50%	48.00%	48.50%
Target B >=	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%
Target C >=	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	41
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	41
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	7
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	24
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	4
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	6

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	7	41	2.22%	47.50%	17.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	31	41	37.78%	81.50%	75.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	41	41	51.11%	81.50%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

ASDOE used the +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group to measure response rates and measure representativeness.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s

analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or an other demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

ASDOE used the +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group to determine representativeness. With a response rate of 100%, the respondents being the same group as the target population, the -3/+3% discrepancy was 0% for all possible demographic groups (race/ethnicity, disability, exit reason, etc). In other words, the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

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

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

ASDOE SPED Staff contacts all students and families through emails and phone calls to get data on the post-school outcomes of students with disabilities within a year after graduating. All leavers (100%) provided information regarding their post school outcomes.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

With a response rate of 100%, there were no non responders. That is, the respondents are the same group as the target population, therefore no nonresponse bias was identified.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=			

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

American Samoa is not required to establish baseline or targets because the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, American Samoa will develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025

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

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

American Samoa is not required to establish baseline or targets because the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, American Samoa will develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage, and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

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

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

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2024). 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 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

To increase the percentage of students with disabilities who will be proficient in reading as measured by Standard Based Assessment (SBA) in the third grade (3rd grade) in all elementary schools.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

American Samoa Grants and Reports Link: <https://www.amsamoadoe.com/copy-of-grant-applications>

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
2022	9.09%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	9.50%	10.00%	10.50%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of students with disabilities in third grade who are proficient in the third grade Statewide Assessment (SBA)	Number of student with disabilities attending third grade	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
1	23	9.09%	9.50%	4.35%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Last year there was 1 student proficient out of 11 students with valid scores. This year there was one student proficient out of 23 students. There are no systemic issues that could explain the slippage. The ASDOE is implementing a K-3 literacy initiative, and although there were no improvements in the proficiency rate, there were improvements in the number of students moving from below basic to basic.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 data.

The data source is the third grade data from file F178, Reading proficiency for students with disabilities which is measured by the Standard Based Assessment (statewide assessment) for American Samoa.

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

The Office of Testing and Evaluation conduct assessments at each school. They gather the data through an automated process and after going through the clean up process and verification the data is posted on the general database for ASDOE. The data manager then requests to the Integrated Data Systems office for access to the data and the generating of standard reports for the Standard Based Assessment results. This data is verified by the EDPass Coordinator and summarized for special education students files for EDFacts submission (F178). The data for the SSIP is the third grade data as submitted on file 178.

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.

American Samoa collects data for the ELSI K-3 initiative by assessing student through a pre and post using the Acadience assessment. This assessment is comprised of a 1 minute fluency, morphology, vocabulary, language assessment, that is administered 4 times a year.

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

American Samoa Theory of Action direct link: https://www.amsamoadoe.com/_files/ugd/bcdca0_c7ec52c29b2d4b4181043cd660b00ef6.pdf

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

NO

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

For SY 2023-2024, ASDOE has fully implemented the K-3 Early Literacy Initiative in all 23 elementary schools.

American Samoa Department of Education scaled up to include grade 3 in the Striving Readers: Early Literacy Initiative K-3 (Read Well & Language for Learning) in the SY 2023-2024.

The collaboration of special education into the ongoing Striving Readers: Early Literacy Initiative K-3 (Read Well & Language for Learning) program provides additional support for students with disabilities. ASDOE-SPED has partnered with DCI to be included in ongoing trainings, in-services and professional developments. The SSIP will help us to collect important evaluation data and individual student outcomes data which are much needed and used for planning improvements to the program.

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.

Professional Development:

In school year 2022-2023, ASDOE rolled out the ELSI K-3 program to include all elementary schools. Since then there have been ongoing trainings that included special education teachers and teachers aid from each school. In SY 2023-2024, ASDOE ELSI K-3 program continues to provide training virtually and face to face. These trainings help provide a refresher as well as an update for new and previous teachers. Trainings are held once a quarter with off island mentors to reinforce strategies.

Monitoring:

Monitoring is conducted through a series of evaluations of teachers teaching the program which is done twice a year. The accountability team along with DCI conducts visits quarterly to monitor if the program is being implemented as suggested. Evaluations are conducted to review the feedback of the teacher and the implementation of the program.

Data:

Data for the ESLI through the acadience is recorded on a database system VPort. Each lead teacher is responsible for inputting results of student works and assessments into VPort. VPort is a database system that helps the lead teacher manage student achievement through the program. This database can track results of students and generate reports for the teachers. Assessment are conducted by proctors assigned by DCI. Once the assessments are done DCI compiles the results and presents the results to the Assistant Director of DCI who in return shares the results with leadership. These results help make decisions at the leadership level to provide more support for all children in the classroom.

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.

Professional Development:

The trainings are ongoing for the teachers and the schools. ASDOE continues to provide support for the teachers and is scheduling to include the ECE Curriculum team and new SPED teachers for a refresher to observe how teachers are immersed into action in promoting student engagement.

Monitoring:

ASDOE will be implementing a progress monitoring tool for student IEP files. This tool will help monitor the goals and objectives of students with disabilities and help provide a visual of their progress.

Data:

The data collected from the acadience will help teachers and team to build on providing strategies and support for children with disabilities in the SBA.

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

Evidence Based practices used in ELSI K-3 initiative are: direct instruction which is scripted, language for learning that is taught for 30 minutes daily, followed by double-dose repeat.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

ELSI K-3 follows a script in the curriculum that teachers follow in order to teach students. The script follows direct instruction on how to delivery and how students can respond and answer.

Language for learning is research-proven content based on analyses of the words, concepts, and sentence structures that are used for teaching, as well as an analysis of the directions and content of textbooks and other instructional materials in grades K-2.

Double-dose repeat allows teachers to go back and reiterate what was taught during reading with their students.

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

These EBP's and activities help support the literacy development of children in school. The whole idea is to be able to develop their literacy skills at a young age to be able to reach a level of proficiency.

Through training only teachers and ASDOE personnel that are certified coaches for Striving readers are able to conduct refresher and professional developments when these trainings are called. Each coach is given a specific group of teachers (e.g all 2nd grade teachers are grouped together, 3rd grade teachers group together).

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

American Samoa is preparing to collect data in FFY 23 as the first group of third graders in the ELSI K-3 reading program will be taking the statewide assessment school year 2023-2024. The quality of the analysis will be drawn from the data collected from all third grade students receiving services from special education in all elementary schools.

The ELSI K-3 program will monitor fidelity to ensure that the Evidence Based Practice (EBP) is being implemented as intended increasing the likelihood of improved student outcomes.

Increased performance can be attributed to the evidence-based practice or performance

should the fidelity be high. The SSIP Core Team will measure fidelity of implementation in schools and per student for the Individual Student Progress Data Portfolio. The ELSI Program assesses fidelity with teacher attendance, classroom environment, student evidence, lesson delivery and teacher interaction with students.

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.

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

These evidence based practices listed below are being scaled up in FFY 2023. We will be reporting progress on the implementation of these practices on third grade in the next reporting period.

ELSI K-3 follows a script in the curriculum that teachers follow in order to teach students. The script follows direct instruction on how to delivery and how students can respond and answer.

Language for learning is research-proven content based on analyses of the words, concepts, and sentence structures that are used for teaching, as well as an analysis of the directions and content of textbooks and other instructional materials in grades K-2.

Double-dose repeat allows teachers to go back and reiterate what was taught during reading with their students.

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

YES

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

The main strategy of the SSIP, the Early Skills Literacy Initiative (ELSI), being implemented from grades K through grade 3, is an American Samoa-wide initiative. This initiative has been evaluated yearly and has continued to be implemented. In SY 2024-2025, ASDOE has a new director, we will learn whether new instructions will be made regarding this initiative along this year.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The ASDOE team brings stakeholders annually to present the progress on the implementation of the SPP/APR. For the SY 23-24 report the stakeholders were convened on January 30, 2025. During this meeting they received a refresher on what the American SAMOA State Performance Plan and had a chance to review all indicators performance and were able to provide input on the progress to implement the SPP. In specific stakeholders were able to confirm their support for the targets of each indicator where applicable (result indicators) and also provided insight on potential reasons for slippage in indicators where there was a decline in performance when compared to last year. No targets were changed as a result of this conversation.

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

In School Year 2023-2024, ASDOE has implemented parent meetings quarterly to share programs and services that are available to support students with disabilities in the schools. A forum was also held to get feedback from the community on how ASDOE can better support students with disabilities not only in the schools but also in the community. Other agencies that are part of the Advisory Council have been able to support student learning in the schools by making sure that facilities are safe and clean, that schools are provided with materials necessary for student learning.

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.

NOT APPLICABLE

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

NOT APPLICABLE

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

NOT APPLICABLE

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Indicator 18: General Supervision

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)
- b. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

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

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 4B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Not Applicable

Indicator 9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Not Applicable

Indicator 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:
Not Applicable

Indicator 11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
6	5	6	5	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

The differences are results of monitoring in FFY 2022.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

For information on how the state verified that the correction of noncompliance reported for Indicator 11, please see the “Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022” in Indicator 11.

ASDOE verified that the school where the five findings were identified is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing a sample of subsequent student files for each of the areas of noncompliance identified (child find). Our procedures for verifying that the source of noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements were:

- The MT conducted on site verification visits to verify documentation of three subsequent files (per Monitoring procedures) for the specific issues of noncompliance related to the finding.
- The MT closed the finding when the school corrected all five specific instances and the three subsequent files indicated 100% compliance on the specific instance of noncompliance (this process happened less than 12 months of issuing the finding).
- With this analysis, ASDOE verified that all areas of noncompliance (child find) were being correctly implemented by the school.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

For information on how the state verified that the correction of noncompliance reported for Indicator 11, please see the “Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022” in Indicator 11.

ASDOE verified that all five instances of noncompliance were corrected; For each individual instance of noncompliance (initial evaluation) the school was required to correct and notified the MT of the completed correction. The MT verified by going back on site and reviewing the specific files related to the five instances above.

Indicator 12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0		0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Not Applicable

Indicator 13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services and needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
2	0	2	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Not Applicable

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

For information on how the state verified that the correction of noncompliance reported for Indicator 13, please see the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022" in Indicator 13.

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

For information on how the state verified that the correction of noncompliance reported for Indicator 13, please see the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022" in Indicator 13.

Optional for FFY 2023, 2024, and 2025:

Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
8	5	8	5	0

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2022	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
13	13		100%	100.00%	N/A	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	0.00%
---	-------

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023)	13
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	13
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	0

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	0
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	0
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	0

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - OSEP Response

18 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Chief State School Officer

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

Name:

Herbert Boat

Title:

State Director

Email:

herbert.boat@doe.as

Phone:

6846331323

Submitted on:

02/03/25 3:33:14 PM