

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

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2019**

**American Samoa**



**PART B DUE  
February 1, 2021**

**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 American Samoa Department of Education would like to direct your attention to the description of the technical assistance American Samoa Part B received as part of its determination status (Needs Assistance 2).

(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) and IDEA Data Center (IDC). 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 NCII, NCIL, Progress Center, among others.

In addition, the National Association of Special Education Directors (NASDSE) and the Councils of Chiefs State School Officers (CCSSO). The forms of TAs received and continuing are through webinars, conference calls, and staff participation in off island conferences hosted by the centers.

American Samoa is also now a member of the NASDSE association and participated in its annual meeting last year. The Special Education division has a representative in ASDOE's work with the CCSSO in Accountability and its effort in implementing change in its system.

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

As a result of the TAs from the NCSI, it gave guidance in implementing proposed activities in the SSIP. Pilot school teachers are using data collection tools to assist with monitoring and tracking student results. The evidence-based model PDSA (Plan, Do, Study, Act) learned from NCSI is used by the SSIP team to follow up its proposed activities. Based on what we learned from the centers participating in the SSIP collaborative, American Samoa SSIP core team has made some refinements to the SSIP activities. Overall with support from NCSI and the other centers the SSIP core team is working on scaling up the SSIP by including two new schools in the SSIP pilot 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 continue to look forward to working with each center to improve results for students with disabilities.

### 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 IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

The American Samoa Department of Education (ASDOE) is a unitary entity which means both state and local education agency (LEA) functions are combined in a single department. The Special Education Division (SPED) is a division of ASDOE that directly administers services to students who are identified with a disability to all public schools in the territory. The ASDOE-SPED's general supervision system reflects this unique context. ASDOE-SPED's general supervision system includes key indicators of performance, regular data collection mechanisms, and processes for identifying and correcting noncompliance as well as identifying areas in need of improvement. These activities help the ASDOE-SPED 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.

The ASDOE-SPED general supervision system includes federally required performance indicators as well as some that the state selected. These ASDOE-SPED selected indicators are based on areas in the system the agency feels are critical to ensuring effective and compliant service delivery. The federally required indicators are part of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR/SSIP). The measurement and required data for reporting performance on these indicators are determined by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and applies to every state and territory.

As with key indicators of performance, the ASDOE-SPED general supervision system includes federally-required data collection and reporting activities and ASDOE-SPED specific ones. Section 618 of IDEA identifies specific data that must be collected and reported to OSEP. The ASDOE-SPED collects data and information on areas that assist them in ensuring that students are receiving their services and allows school based staff to describe potential areas where they need support. Any formal complaints submitted to the ASDOE-SPED will be handled appropriately through the process of resolving disagreements as described in table below.

#### Informal Process

1. Consult SPED teacher
2. If problem not resolved talk to the RS, if problem still not resolved
3. Talk to VP/Principal for resolution If resolution not agreed upon go on to next process (formal)

#### Formal Process

1. A complaint/disagreement must be put into writing, signed and dated prior to submission to the division 3 Part B
2. There will be an investigation of the problem by the division within 60 days or more depending on exceptional circumstances

3. Mediation may be requested with a third party to help resolve the disagreement if the problem is not solved after this
4. A formal request for a due process hearing may be submitted to the Director of the SPED.

The impartial hearing officer will make a decision after hearing both sides of the problem. The division of ASDOE-SPED that is responsible for citing, tracking and correcting noncompliance is the Compliance monitoring team.

#### **Technical Assistance System**

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

Technical Assistance (TA) and training are critical for ensuring implementation of IDEA requirements and assisting in identifying effective strategies to improve 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 three 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.

ASDOE SPED received technical assistance from National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and on-going monthly webinars and conference calls. ASDOE leaders were also able to participate in OSEP-funded TA virtual conferences throughout SY 2019-2020.

#### **Professional Development System**

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

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 resource specialist to discuss progress on the implementation of the SSIP and other IDEA requirements. These meetings offer a unique 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 Involvement**

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

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team agreed to form a Steering Committee of selected team leaders and facilitators, and divided all the indicators among three Workgroups (Cluster Teams): FAPE & LRE, General Supervision, and Transition. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The Steering Committee is a broad-based stakeholder group that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. The Committee is selected from ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents, the AS Community College, the private sectors, a Fono representative (legislator) and other government agencies. The Steering Committee is chaired by the State Director of Special Education.

The Steering Committee held three meetings during the SPP process including the SSIP. The Deputy Director of Instructional Services of the Department of Education was present at the opening meeting and remain involved throughout the SPP process. Breakout sessions in all three Steering Committee meetings gave the stakeholders the opportunity to share their input according to the specific areas of the SPP. This series of meetings along with many individual workgroup meetings enabled us to obtain broad input from the stakeholders. These series of meetings along with many individual workgroup meetings enabled us to obtain broad input from the stakeholders.

Overall, stakeholders provide input on the APR and the SSIP development. With the data collected and analyzed, stakeholders suggest rigorous targets for American Samoa. This input by stakeholders has helped facilitate targets set for the FFY 2013-2018 APR.

Because OSEP extended the current SPP with one extra year, on January 29, 2020, SPED convened a stakeholders meeting to offer input on extended targets for results indicators. American Samoa will convene a stakeholders meeting in 2021 to solicit input on targets for all indicators where this is applicable for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR.

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

NO

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

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR**

**§300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

The ASDOE is a single district. We do not have LEAs. ASDOE will report its SPP/APR to the public. The SPP/APR are disseminated to the public through the media, and also posted at the ASDOE website.

The FFY 2019 APR will be found in the following link once it is submitted (after final submission during clarification week). Previous APR submissions are also found in the same link.

FFY 2019 weblink: <https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-Untitled.html>

Besides the web-access, announcements about the Annual Performance Report are made on TV and local newspapers. After the final version of the APR is completed (after clarification week), copies will be available at the Special Education Office in Faga'alu. ASDOE Special Education division reports annually to the public on the progress and/slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets in our SPP.

Annually, American Samoa holds a "public hearing" to present to the public areas in the APR. The public is able to ask questions, clear up issues or concerns they may have.

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

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, American Samoa must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, American Samoa must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the American Samoa must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since American Samoa's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

American Samoa's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In American Samoa's 2020 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 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, 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 2018 SPP/APR**

The ASDOE is a single district. We do not have LEAs. ASDOE will report its SPP/APR to the public. The SPP/APR are disseminated to the public through the media, and also posted at the ASDOE website. The FFY 2018 APR will be found in the following link once it is submitted (after final submission during clarification week). Previous APR submissions are also found in the same link.

FFY 2019 weblink: <https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-REPORTS.html>

Besides the web-access, announcements about the Annual Performance Report are made on TV and local newspapers. After the final version of the APR is completed (after clarification week), copies will be available at the Special Education Office in Faga'alu. ASDOE Special Education division reports annually to the public on the progress and/slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets in our SPP.

Annually, American Samoa holds a "public hearing" to present to the public areas in the APR such as Assessment. The Statewide Assessment for general education (Standards Based Assessment SBA) with and without accommodations and the American Samoa Alternate Assessment (ASAA) performance and participation for students with disabilities are shared with the stakeholders during these opportunities. The public is able to ask questions, clear up issues or concerns they may have.

## **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) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

#### Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	68.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%
Data	84.09%	92.86%	100.00%	93.33%	95.83%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	87.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	27
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	29
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	93.10%

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
27	29	95.83%	87.00%	93.10%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

Other

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

American Samoa is not required to meet the Title 1 accountability standards. Special Education Division has been using graduation rate data and calculation the same as the one established by American Samoa DOE since the beginning of the SPP/APR.

American Samoa uses the General Education synthetic (or cohort) method to calculate the Graduation Rate as indicated below:  
 $GRADUATION\ RATE = \frac{Total\ Grad}{Total\ Grad + Gr9\ DO + Gr10\ DO + Gr11\ DO + 12Gr\ DO + 12Gr\ RC + RMA}$

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 Eng
- 3 years of Math
- 4 years of Hist.
- 3 years of Science
- 1 Physical Education
- 1 Vocational Ed.
- 1 Samoan
- 3 Electives

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

FFY 2018 Graduation Data: (SY 2018-2019)  
 Number of youths with IEP's graduating with a regular diploma: 27  
 Number of youths with IEP's eligible to graduate: 29  
 (Number of youths with IEP who dropped out: 6  
 Number of Youths with IEP'S who received a certificate: 2  
 Number of youths with IEP's who reached maximum age: 0)

Calculation:  $27/29 = 93.10\%$

Graduation Rate: 77.14%

**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)**

Data Correction:

Upon clarification from PSC, the "number of youths eligible to graduate" would include students who were seniors before they dropped out. Therefore American Samoa requests an edit on the denominator of this indicator to add four students who dropped out on their senior year. The calculation would then be  $27/33$  which would result on the graduation rate of 81.82%.

Explanation of slippage: In SY 2018-2019 American Samoa DOE had two students with severe disabilities receive certificates of completion and four students dropped out in their senior year. This explains the slippage on graduation rates.

B1 data is complete, valid and reliable. There was no impact from Covid 19.

**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 dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

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.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	4.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Data	2.27%	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	3.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provided input on the APR development. With the data collected and analyzed, stakeholders suggested rigorous targets for American Samoa. This input by stakeholders has helped facilitate targets set for the FFY 2013-2018 APR. Stakeholders were invited on January 29, 2020 to provide input on the target for the extension of the SPP for FFY 2019 APR for Indicator 2. More information on who are American Samoa stakeholders is described in our introduction.

### Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
--------	------	-------------	------

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	27
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	2
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	0
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	6
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	0

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

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

YES

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

American Samoa uses option 2, the information reported in FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1st 2012. American Samoa uses for the denominator in this calculation the total number of high school students with IEP's.

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
6	205	0.00%	3.00%	2.93%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**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, and 11 Part B
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 below.**

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

Explanation of Slippage: In SY 2018-19 six students dropped out of school, compared to zero students in SY 2017-18. American Samoa knows the specific reasons each of these six students left school, but due to prevent the identity of these students American Samoa will not report this information here. American Samoa is working with schools and its partnering agencies to prevent situations leading to students dropping out.



B2 data is complete, valid and reliable.

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

### 3B - Indicator Data

#### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%
A	Overall	98.26%	Actual	98.26%	99.19%	92.31%	87.31%	90.82%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%
A	Overall	98.26%	Actual	98.26%	98.66%	93.59%	86.29%	87.76%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.50%
Math	A >=	Overall	98.50%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

#### Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

#### Date:

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			90.82%	98.50%		N/A	N/A

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			87.76%	98.50%		N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3B - OSEP Response**

**3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

#### Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

#### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	13.51%	14.01%	14.51%	15.01%	15.51%
A	Overall	13.51%	Actual	13.51%	12.71%	12.50%	9.88%	14.04%

#### Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	16.22%	16.72%	17.22%	17.72%	17.72%
A	Overall	16.22%	Actual	16.22%	3.79%	8.22%	7.65%	9.88%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	16.01%
Math	A >=	Overall	18.22%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

#### FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

#### Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

#### Date:

#### Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			14.04%	16.01%		N/A	N/A

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			9.88%	18.22%		N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

**3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$ .

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	0.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provided input on the APR development. With the data collected and analyzed, stakeholders suggested rigorous targets for American Samoa. This input by stakeholders has helped facilitate targets set for the FFY 2013-2018 APR. Stakeholders were invited on January 29, 2020 to provide input on the target for the extension of the SPP for FFY 2019 APR for Indicator 4A. More information on who are American Samoa stakeholders is described in our introduction.



**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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**

4A. 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 nondisabled children suspended and expelled in a school year.

4A. Methodology:

Number of children with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days in a school year

Number of nondisabled 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 nondisabled children

In school year 2018-2019, there were no students with disabilities who were suspended for greater than 10 days. Therefore there was no significant discrepancy for suspensions and expulsion For greater than 10 days in FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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.**

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 2018**

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 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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:

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

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

#### 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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

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

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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

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's student population are primarily composed of Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders. This indicator does not apply to American Samoa.

#### 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 4B - OSEP Response

#### 4B- Required Actions

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

#### Instructions

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

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

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%
A	95.00%	Data	92.27%	88.96%	90.00%	89.15%	94.26%
B	2005	Target <=	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	1.50%
B	1.70%	Data	2.76%	4.22%	4.56%	5.01%	0.00%
C	2005	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	0.00%
C	0.00%	Data	0.28%	0.32%	0.53%	0.33%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	95.50%
Target B <=	1.50%
Target C <=	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	520
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	465
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	0

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	465	520	94.26%	95.50%	89.42%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	0	520	0.00%	1.50%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	520	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	There were 29 students in resource room in FFY 2018 and this number got increased to 45 students in FFY 2019. This increase of 16 students in the resource room (receiving services 79% to 40% in the general education classroom) explains why there was slippage. We reviewed the IEP of these students, they are receiving services in the least restrictive environment. The reasons for the increase in the number of students in resource rooms are, for example, some of the Autistic, Visual Impaired and Multiple Disability students are now receiving services in the resource room from 40 to 79% of the time, as opposed to 80% of the time last year. There are new hearing impaired students who are receiving ASL classes in the resource room, and hence are also in the category 40 to 79% of their time in the regular classroom.

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:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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 aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2011	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B	2011	Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	0.00%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	100.00%
Target B <=	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	64
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	64
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	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 2019 SPP/APR Data**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	64	64	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	64	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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 2 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2009	Target >=	93.30%	93.80%	94.30%	94.80%	94.80%
A1	91.30%	Data	93.33%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A2	2009	Target >=	73.40%	73.90%	74.40%	74.90%	74.90%



A2	71.40%	Data	90.00%	91.67%	83.33%	76.19%	91.67%
B1	2009	Target >=	74.70%	75.20%	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%
B1	72.70%	Data	87.50%	100.00%	100.00%	81.82%	100.00%
B2	2009	Target >=	57.10%	57.60%	58.10%	58.60%	58.60%
B2	55.10%	Data	85.00%	91.67%	83.33%	71.43%	91.67%
C1	2009	Target >=	74.70%	75.20%	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%
C1	72.70%	Data	81.25%	100.00%	100.00%	90.91%	100.00%
C2	2009	Target >=	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%	54.50%	54.50%
C2	51.00%	Data	85.00%	95.83%	91.67%	76.19%	95.83%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	94.80%
Target A2 >=	74.90%
Target B1 >=	76.20%
Target B2 >=	58.60%
Target C1 >=	76.20%
Target C2 >=	54.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provided input on the APR development. With the data collected and analyzed, stakeholders suggested rigorous targets for American Samoa. This input by stakeholders has helped facilitate targets set for the FFY 2013-2018 APR. Stakeholders were invited on January 29, 2020 to provide input on the target for the extension of the SPP for FFY 2019 APR for Indicator 6. More information on who are American Samoa stakeholders is described in our introduction.

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

20

#### 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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	10.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3	15.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	25.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	50.00%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	8	10	100.00%	94.80%	80.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age	15	20	91.67%	74.90%	75.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
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>							

**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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	5	25.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	25.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	50.00%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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>	10	10	100.00%	76.20%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	15	20	91.67%	58.60%	75.00%	Met 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	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	5	25.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	25.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	50.00%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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	10	10	100.00%	76.20%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	15	20	95.83%	54.50%	75.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	Compared to FFY 2018, in FFY 2019 American Samoa schools identified two preschool students in Outcome A1 positive social emotional skills who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. One extra student improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. Because of COVID 19 schools were shutdown and operated remotely with families through packages for students. Although this process allowed schools to operate, it hindered teacher access to the students and families which impacted how students performed.

**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 Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

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

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

Slippage for A2, B2, C2: Compared to FFY 2018, in FFY 2019 American Samoa schools struggled to maintain preschool children performance on the three preschool outcomes. Because of COVID 19 schools were shutdown and operated remotely with families through packages for students. Although this process allowed schools to operate, it hindered teacher access to the students and families which impacted how students performed.

This data is complete, valid and reliable.

## 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 2 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.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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

Stakeholders provided input on the APR development. With the data collected and analyzed, stakeholders suggested rigorous targets for American Samoa. This input by stakeholders has helped facilitate targets set for the FFY 2013-2018 APR. Stakeholders were invited on January 29, 2020 to provide input on the target for the extension of the SPP for FFY 2019 APR for Indicator 8. More information on who are American Samoa stakeholders is described in our introduction.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	66.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	87.50%	88.00%	88.50%	89.00%	89.50%
Data	87.52%	87.01%	80.32%	90.85%	91.03%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	89.50%

#### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
372	441	91.03%	89.50%	84.35%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

511

Percentage of respondent parents

86.30%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The survey questions where parents rated engaged the lowest were related to special assistance to parents to participate in the IEP meeting, the participation on the statewide assessments, accommodations the child would need, written justification for the extent that their child would receive services in the regular classroom. This lower rating this year could be explained by the challenges schools had, first with the Measles outbreak (November, December 2019, and January 2020), and later Covid 19 (Spring 2020). Schools were closed for a period of time and returned to operations, with services delivered in staggered fashion. Therefore, for a period of time, parents located in remote villages, without internet services or other communications, were not engaged with the school activities the same way they usually participate in normal times.

**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.**

American Samoa Department of Education-Special Education continues to use the same survey from previous years. This survey is used to combine data from school age and pre-school children.

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

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

Despite Covid 19, this year there was an increase in parents responding to the survey. Last year we had a response rate of 79.34%, and this year, the response rate was 84.35%. All schools were represented. Furthermore, the respondent families as well as all the target families are all Pacific Islanders (same race/ethnicity). An analysis indicates the 441 respondents (84.35% of the target population) are representative of all schools and the race-ethnicity of the target population.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 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 FFY 2018, 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, etc. 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

American Samoa student population are primarily composed of Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders. This indicator does not apply to American Samoa.

### 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 618 data for FFY 2019, 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, etc. 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

YES

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

American Samoa student population are primarily composed of Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders. This indicator does not apply to American Samoa.

### 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 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
205	205	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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



**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.**

**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.**

Method used to collect data:

American Samoa has a database 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 Resource 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)**

This data is complete, valid and reliable.

There were five students whose parents consented to evaluate, but these parents refused to produce the child for the evaluation because of the Measles outbreak, then COVID-19 pandemic. The evaluation team offered the parents alternate ways to evaluate their children, but the parents opted not to have their children evaluated in this school year.

American Samoa did not include these five students in the numerator (a) or denominator (b) of this indicator based on 34 CFR §300.301(d), which indicates 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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 2018**

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

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	67.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	8
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.	8
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.	0
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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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.	8	8	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.

American Samoa has an Early Childhood Coordinator that collaboratively works with Part C and ECE HeadStart 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 2018**

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 2018**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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:** Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

#### 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 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 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, etc.) 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	98.80%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
113	113	100.00%	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.**

Data was collected from all students 16 years of age and up within six high schools and Juvenile Detention Center. According to actual data collected, there were a total of 505 IEPs in ASDOE during SY 2019-2020. Out of 520 IEPs, a total of 113 students were at age 16 and older.

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.

It was based on these criteria that the American Samoa monitoring team reviewed the IEPs of students who were at age 16 and older. The 100% data reported in the FFY 2019 APR is based on all of the files reviewed being in compliance with all of the eight components indicated above. (If all 8 items are answered „YES? or „NA?, then 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 2018**

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 2018**

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

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**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:** Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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, 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.

*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, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

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.

#### 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 should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	23.00%	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%
A	19.00%	Data	29.55%	15.00%	26.67%	53.33%	12.50%
B	2009	Target >=	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%
B	33.00%	Data	61.36%	70.00%	60.00%	90.00%	50.00%
C	2009	Target >=	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%
C	48.00%	Data	86.36%	82.50%	70.00%	96.67%	100.00%

### FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	28.00%
Target B >=	41.00%
Target C >=	57.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provided input on the APR development. With the data collected and analyzed, stakeholders suggested rigorous targets for American Samoa. This input by stakeholders has helped facilitate targets set for the the FFY 2013-2018 APR. Stakeholders were invited on January 29, 2020 to provide input on the target for the extension of the SPP for FFY 2019 APR for Indicator 14. More information on who are American Samoa stakeholders is described in our introduction.

For indicator 14, targets for A, B, and C is set to a 1% increase from FFY 2013 to FFY 2019 APR.

### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	35
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	11
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	6
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).	7



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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	11	35	12.50%	28.00%	31.43%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	17	35	50.00%	41.00%	48.57%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	28	35	100.00%	57.00%	80.00%	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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

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

**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.**

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

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

Slippage for B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2): The reason for slippage was a reduction on the number of students who were competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. There was an improvement on the students enrolled in college, but that was not enough to compensate for a reduction on the number of students who were competitively employed. Some reasons for reduction on the number of students who were competitively employed include three students that who were laid off due to the measles outbreak and then the COVID 19 epidemic. If those three students were still working we would have had progress.

Slippage for 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). Due to the measles and Covid 19 outbreak some of the families jobs such as selling produce in tents on the side of the roads were eliminated. Many of our students participated in those activities. Markets were closed and busses operated with limited capacity. There fore many families opted for keeping their kids at home. Some of them were recent graduates with disabilities.

This data were complete, valid, and reliable.

**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 baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	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

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.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data					

#### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

#### FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**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 baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	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

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.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data					

### Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

### FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

**16 - 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:**

TERESA ATUATASI

##### **Title:**

STATE DIRECTOR

##### **Email:**

teresa.atuatasi@doe.as

##### **Phone:**

6842543373

##### **Submitted on:**

02/01/21 4:12:20 PM