

AS Part B

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

1

General Supervision System:

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

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. The ASDOE-SPED indicators relate to six priority areas: 1) Free Appropriate Public Education, 2) Individualized Education Programs, 3) Least Restrictive Environment, 4) Reevaluation, 5) Identification and Evaluation, 6) Procedural Safeguards.

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	Formal Process
1. Consult SPED teacher	1. A complaint/disagreement must be put into writing, signed and dated prior to submission to the division
2. If problem not resolved talk to the RS, if problem still not resolved	2. There will be an investigation of the problem by the division within 60 days or more depending on exceptional circumstances
3. Talk to VP/Principal for resolution	3. Mediation may be requested with a third party to help resolve the disagreement if the problem is not solved after this
If resolution not agreed upon go on to next process (formal)	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.

At the end of each school year, the compliance monitoring team determines which schools will receive an on-site visit the following school year. The selections are made to ensure a variety of school types are included each year (e.g., large/small, primary/secondary/early childhood programs). American Samoa has a three-year monitoring cycle for the 24 schools (6 high school and 23 elementary schools) and 22 ECE programs on the islands. This information is published in the ASDOE calendar which all staff and administrators receive.

The monitoring process involves the review of documents including student files and IEPs, and structured interviews with administrators, teachers, parents, related service providers, and others as appropriate. Upon the monitoring team's arrival on campus, a briefing session is held with the school principal.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

resource specialist and the monitoring team. Upon completion of the on-site review, a debriefing session is conducted with the school staff and the Resource Specialist. During this meeting, areas of preliminary findings are discussed. A written report is then developed which describes the school's strengths, areas of noncompliance, and required corrective actions. It is the principal's responsibility to work collaboratively with the Division of Special Education to develop and implement a written plan to address identified areas of deficiency. Documentation of completed corrective actions must be submitted to the Compliance monitoring team and subsequently to the director of Special Education.

Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, ASDOE-SPED has included in its policies and procedures the timely correction of non compliance (as soon as possible but no longer than 12 months since issuing findings) by using the two prong tests.

The ASDOE-SPED monitoring team reviews their monitoring tools and practices regularly to ensure that they are appropriately identifying and correcting noncompliance. Information gathered through a review of findings and strengths is used to design training and support to the school staff.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

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

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 four Program Directors who are placed in the districts and oversee the SPED programs in their designated districts. They work directly with a group of Resource Specialists and together they provide direct TA to schools. This team also includes a group of related service professionals.

ASDO SPED received technical assistance from National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) through on-going monthly webinars and conference calls.

ASDOE also received direct technical assistance from Center of Integrating IDEA Data (CIID) on July 2016 and in July 2017 when members of the SSIP/APR team were part of the OSEP Leadership conference in DC.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

Professional Development System:

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

ASDOE-SPED provides a professional development system that is directly linked to the SPP/APR and monitoring activities to help schools and programs: 1) understand the requirements related to these indicators; and 2) develop and implement meaningful improvement plans to correct noncompliance, enhance their performance, and improve results for children and families.

The ASDOE-SPED indicators relate to six priority areas: 1) Free Appropriate Public Education, 2) Individualized Education Programs, 3) Least Restrictive Environment, 4) Reevaluation, 5) Identification and Evaluation, 6) Procedural Safeguards.

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-compliances have been corrected.

ASDOE-SPED Data Manager also has a schedule of trainings and TAs for the school and classroom levels. Data collection require the Resource 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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

American Samoa's ten member 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 process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP development.

The Steering Committee is a broad-based stakeholder group that provided input into the development of the SPP. 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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The AS DOE is a single district. We do not have LEAs. ASDOE will report its SPP/APR to the public.

The SPP/APR will be disseminated to the public through the media, and posted at ASDOE website (<http://www.asdoe.net/>). Announcements will be on TV and local newspapers. Copies will be available at the Special Education Office in Faga'alu. ASDOE Special Education division will report annually to the public on the progress and/slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets in our SPP.

The ASDOE website is currently not in service. According to the individual who oversees this task from ASDOE ERATE Office the website is down temporarily and should have been up and running by the end of last week. Unfortunately, after re-checking, the website is still down. As soon as it is up we will work on getting the link so it will go directly to the site.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	82.00%	83.00%
Data		68.00%	71.00%	78.00%	86.00%	86.00%	81.00%	91.00%	81.00%	90.91%	84.09%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	84.00%
Data	92.86%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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 the FFY 2013-2018 APR.

For indicator B1, targets were set to start with 82% and an increase of 1% for the next 5 years. Our goal is to set a 5% increase for this 5 years timeline. Data is prepopulated from 618 reports via Edfacts.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
			null	30
			null	30
				Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

Although 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. Per OSEP requirement ASDOE uses data from SY 2015-2016 for the FFY 2016 APR due February 1, 2018. That being said, we used the General Education synthetic (or cohort) method to guide us in calculating the Graduation Rate as indicated below:

$$\text{GRADUATION RATE} = (\text{Total Grad}) / (\text{Total Grad} + \text{Gr9 DO} + \text{Gr10 DO} + \text{Gr11 DO} + 12\text{Gr DO} + 12\text{Gr RC} + \text{RMA}).$$

Therefore, our data collected in SY 2015-2016 showed that 30 of 12th grade graduates received regular diploma divided by total graduates receiving regular diploma which is 30 + (0) 12th grade who received a certificate + (0) dropout + (0) Reached Maximum Age = 30

$$30/30 = 100\%$$

The Calculation is: 30/30 = 100% Graduation rate

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
30	30	92.86%	85.00%	100%

Graduation Conditions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

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 = (Total Grad)/(Total Grad + Gr9 DO + Gr10 DO + Gr11 DO + 12Gr DO + 12Gr RC + RMA).

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.80%	4.40%	4.40%	3.60%	4.20%	3.20%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Data		4.00%	4.20%	2.00%	0.50%	0.50%	3.06%	1.00%	1.54%	1.84%	2.27%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	3.00%
Data	1.79%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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 the FFY 2013-2018 APR.

For indicator B2, a thorough review of the actual data for the past years suggested that a realistic target of 3% for the 5 years timeline is appropriate.

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

- Option 1
- Option 2

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

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	190	1.79%	3.00%	0%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

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

This is the methology used in FFY 2010 APR. Dropout is calculated by dividing the number of students who dropped out in SY 2015-16 (for FFY 2016 APR) and who were reported on file C009, by the child count of students with IEPs ages 14-21 reported in file C002 (for SY 2015-16).

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

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

3. did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:

* moved known to continue or 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? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			100%	100%	95.00%	95.00%	100%	100%	100%	98.15%	98.50%
			Data		99.28%	96.20%	93.10%	96.50%	96.00%	94.00%	99.00%	99.00%	98.15%	98.26%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			100%	100%	95.00%	95.00%	100%	100%	100%	98.15%	98.50%
			Data		99.28%	96.20%	97.10%	98.00%	96.70%	96.00%	99.00%	99.00%	98.15%	98.26%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	98.50%
		Data	99.19%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	98.50%
		Data	98.66%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%
Math	A ≥ Overall	98.50%	98.50%	98.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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.

For indicator 3B, American Samoa continues the process of changing the types of assessment requiring that we establish new baselines since the start of this process. In FFY 2012, the SAT-10 was offered to grades 3 through 8 and 10. In FFY 2013, we established a new baseline and target because only grades 4, 8 and 12 were given the test. For FFY 2014, we established new baselines and targets again. This time, ASDOE utilized the Standards Based Assessment (SBA). Only grades 3 and 5 were assessed with the SBA. The Alternate Assessment was offered to students in grades 3 through 8 and 10. Due to the variation of grades tested in the last two years, a new baseline was set for this indicator based on FFY 2014 data. For FFY 2016 ASDOE tested students in grades 3, 5, 7, and 10 using the Standards Based Assessment. ASDOE administered the American Samoa Alternate Assessment (ASAA) to students in grades 3 through 8 and 10.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	234	216	99.19%	98.50%	92.31%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

There were no changes in procedures in the administration of the statewide assessment from SY 2015-16 to SY 2016-17. However, the number of students with disabilities not participating in the assessment more than doubled. In SY 2015-16 we had 6 students not participating and in SY 2016-17 we had 15 students not participating in reading assessments.

The reasons for students not participating are, aside from Medical Exemption:

Students were not present the days of testing

Students were not present during the make up allotted time slot.

We will examine our procedures and work with schools, parents, and students to make sure the participation rate improves in the Spring 2018 administration of the statewide assessment for reading and math.

Student Participated
Student
Difference

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Participated

	<i>SY 15-16</i>	<i>SY 16-17</i>	
Grade 3	38	37	-1
Grade 5	61	59	-2
Grade 7	5	63	+58
HS	4	44	+40

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	234	219	98.66%	98.50%	93.59%

Reasons for Group A Slippage

The same reasons discussed for the participation of students with disabilities in reading applies to the administration of statewide assessments in math.

For math, students not participating in SY 15-16 (14) increased to 18 students in SY 16-17.

	<i>Student Participated</i>		Difference
	<i>SY 15-16</i>	<i>SY 16-17</i>	
Grade 3	37	38	-1
Grade 5	61	60	-1
Grade 7	61	62	+1
HS	40	46	+6

Public Reporting Information

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

ASDOE reports on all students (not a separate report for non-disabled children) on its Territorial Report Card. It does report students with disabilities together with all students. It also reports students with disabilities separately, as a subgroup.

There are two ways that the information about Assessment is shared to the public. First, through the ASDOE website and second, through an annual public hearing which occurs around April of each year.

The ASDOE website is currently not in service. According to the individual who oversees this task from ASDOE ERATE Office the website is down temporarily and should have been up and running by the end of last week. Unfortunately, after re-checking, the website is still down. As soon as it is up we will work on getting the link so it will go directly to the site.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			9.00%	10.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	9.00%	10.00%	7.08%	13.51%
			Data		6.89%	7.00%	5.10%	5.23%	7.00%	11.00%	13.00%	3.00%	7.08%	13.51%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			27.00%	28.00%	5.00%	60.00%	70.00%	9.00%	9.00%	25.94%	16.22%
			Data		24.63%	32.80%	4.40%	5.73%	7.00%	8.00%	13.00%	3.00%	25.94%	16.22%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	14.01%
		Data	12.71%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	16.72%
		Data	3.79%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	14.51%	15.01%	15.51%
Math	A ≥ Overall	17.22%	17.72%	18.22%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's ten member 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 WRRRC/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 process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP development.

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

The Steering Committee held three meetings during the SPP process. 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. Stakeholders also had the chance to share their input on the APR data for the past five years. With the data collected and reported, stakeholders suggested that targets must be realistic and therefore were gauged appropriately.

Stakeholders provide input on the APR development. With the data collected and analyzed, stakeholders suggest rigorous targets for American Samoa. This input by stakeholders has helped facilitate the revised targets set for the FFY 2014-2018 APR (the stakeholders suggested a 0.5 percentual point annual increase from the baseline established in FFY 2014).

For indicator 3C, American Samoa continues the process of changing the types of assessment requiring that we establish new baselines since the start of this process. In FFY 2012, the SAT-10 was offered to grades 3 to 8 and 10. In FFY 2013, we established a new baseline and target because only grades 4, 8 and 12 were given the test. For FFY 2014, we have established new baselines and target again. This time, ASDOE is using the Standards Based Assessment (SBA). Only grades 3 and 5 were assessed with this new test. The Alternate Assessment was offered to students in grade levels 3 through 8 and 10. Due to the variation of grades tested in the last two years, a new baseline is set for this indicator based on FFY 2014 data.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	216	27	12.71%	14.51%	12.50%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	219	18	3.79%	17.22%	8.22%

Public Reporting Information

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

ASDOE reports on all students (not a separate report for non-disabled children) on its Territorial Report Card. It does report students with disabilities together with all students. It also reports students with disabilities separately, as a subgroup.

There are two ways that the information about Assessment is shared to the public. First, through the ASDOE website and second, through an annual public hearing which occurs around April of each year.

The ASDOE website is currently not in service. According to the individual who oversees this task from ASDOE ERATE Office the website is down temporarily and should have been up and running by the end of last week. Unfortunately, after re-checking the website is still down. As soon as it is up we will work on getting the link so it will go directly to the site.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	1.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0%
Data	0%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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.

For indicator 4A, targets were thoughtfully considered due to American Samoa's situation as a single entity. It was well discussed that the targets for the next years of this planning be considerate of this fact. Therefore, as a team, targets for 4A remains at 0% for FFY2013-FFY2018 APR.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	1	0%	0%	0%

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

$$\text{Significant Discrepancy} = \frac{\text{Total number of children with IEPs}}{\text{Total number of nondisabled children}} \times 100 > \frac{\text{Total number of children with IEPs}}{\text{Total number of nondisabled children}} \times 100$$

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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)

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

FFY	2015
Target	
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target			

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
null	null	null	0%		

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
		Data		95.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.64%	92.27%
B	2005	Target ≤			5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	4.00%	4.00%
		Data		1.70%	3.00%	3.40%	5.00%	5.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	3.75%	2.76%
C	2005	Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1.00%	1.00%
		Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.26%	0.28%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	95.00%
	Data	88.96%
B	Target ≤	4.00%
	Data	4.22%
C	Target ≤	1.00%
	Data	0.32%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%
Target B ≤	4.00%	4.00%	1.50%
Target C ≤	1.00%	1.00%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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.

With stakeholder input, American Samoa revised its targets for Indicator B5 for FFY 2013 to FFY 2018 as follows:

2012 baseline	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A= 91	95	95	95	95	95	95.5
B= 4	4	4	4	4	4	1.5
C= 0	0	0	0	0	0	0

American Samoa appreciates OSEP's efforts on guidance and assistance by providing technical support through the clarification period to assist American Samoa to improve its APR targets for improvement in the next six years.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	570	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	513	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	26	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	n	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	n	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	513	570	88.96%	95.00%	90.00%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	26	570	4.22%	4.00%	4.56%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3	570	0.32%	1.00%	0.53%

Reasons for B Slippage

From SY15-16 to SY16-17 there has been a reduction on the number of students identified with mild disabilities, such as SLD, who are traditionally served 80% or more of their time in the general classroom, while there has been an increase on the number of students with disabilities traditionally requiring more intensive supports, such as Autism (4 new students), and intellectual disabilities (2 new students). These more intensive needs students' IEPs likely reflect more services to be provided in a resource room. This explains the slippage (if we had a reduction from 26 to 24 students in this category it would show we had progress and not slippage). In other words, providing services to students requiring more intensive needs due to the nature of their disability in a more restrictive setting may be their appropriate least restrictive environment.

Disability Category	Student Count		
	SY 15-16	SY 16-17	
Specific Learning Disabilities	518	468	-50
Autism	6	10	+4
Intellectual Disability	7	9	+2

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥								100%	100%	100%	100%
		Data								100%	100%	100%	100%
B	2011	Target ≤								0%	0%	0%	0%
		Data								0%	0%	0%	0%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	100%
	Data	100%
B	Target ≤	0%
	Data	0%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	100%	100%	100%
Target B ≤	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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.

For indicator B6, targets were reviewed and team decided to keep it as it is at 100% for 6A and 0% for 6B for the next 5 years.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	29	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	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	29	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	n	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	---	---	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	29	29	100%	100%	100%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	29	0%	0%	0%

Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2009	Target ≥						91.30%	91.30%	91.30%	92.30%	92.80%	93.30%
		Data					92.90%	91.30%	74.10%	90.90%	94.70%	91.67%	93.33%
A2	2009	Target ≥						71.40%	71.40%	71.40%	72.40%	72.90%	73.40%
		Data					72.70%	71.40%	67.60%	78.00%	88.20%	90.91%	90.00%
B1	2009	Target ≥						72.70%	72.70%	72.70%	73.70%	74.20%	74.70%
		Data					75.00%	72.70%	79.70%	89.50%	77.70%	80.00%	87.50%
B2	2009	Target ≥						55.10%	55.10%	55.10%	56.10%	56.60%	57.10%
		Data					54.50%	55.10%	54.10%	83.10%	88.20%	77.27%	85.00%
C1	2009	Target ≥						72.70%	72.70%	72.70%	73.70%	74.20%	74.70%
		Data					71.40%	72.70%	78.10%	93.30%	90.00%	88.89%	81.25%
C2	2009	Target ≥						51.00%	51.00%	51.00%	52.00%	52.50%	53.00%
		Data					50.00%	51.00%	67.60%	88.10%	86.70%	81.82%	85.00%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	93.80%
	Data	100%
A2	Target ≥	73.90%
	Data	91.67%
B1	Target ≥	75.20%
	Data	100%
B2	Target ≥	57.60%
	Data	91.67%
C1	Target ≥	75.20%
	Data	100%
C2	Target ≥	53.50%
	Data	95.83%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	94.30%	94.80%	94.80%
Target A2 ≥	74.40%	74.90%	74.90%
Target B1 ≥	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%
Target B2 ≥	58.10%	58.60%	58.60%
Target C1 ≥	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%
Target C2 ≥	54.00%	54.50%	54.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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.

For indicator B7, the discussion of actual data for the past years compare to the targets arrives to the consensus that an increase of .5% or half a percent from 2013 to 2017. For year 2018, the targets will be the same as 2017.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	12.00
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2.00	16.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2.00	16.67%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8.00	66.67%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4.00	4.00	100%	94.30%	100%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	10.00	12.00	91.67%	74.40%	83.33%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2.00	16.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2.00	16.67%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8.00	66.67%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4.00	4.00	100%	75.70%	100%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	10.00	12.00	91.67%	58.10%	83.33%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1.00	8.33%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2.00	16.67%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	9.00	75.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool	3.00	3.00	100%	75.70%	100%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)					
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	11.00	12.00	95.83%	54.00%	91.67%

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

Was sampling used? No

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

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

American Samoa's assessment tool is Teaching Strategies GOLD Child Assessment Portfolio. It is used with individual children and the COSF approach is used to complete the ratings. Stakeholders (Parents, ECE/Head Start Teachers, Part B Early Childhood Teachers) reviewed the quality of the COSF's and the aggregate COSF data. The Part B Early Childhood teachers complete the COSF data. Then the Special Education Early Childhood Coordinator aggregates the data, summarizes it, present it to the stakeholders for a final check and then enters it on the Grads360.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			70.00%	75.00%	77.00%	85.00%	87.00%	90.00%	92.00%	87.00%	87.50%
Data		66.00%	81.00%	82.00%	89.00%	91.00%	88.00%	91.00%	92.00%	87.16%	87.52%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	88.00%
Data	87.01%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	88.50%	89.00%	89.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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.

For indicator 8, historical data made a huge impact on Stakeholders decision. The data showed that our targets were very high. Therefore, we are setting new targets for the next five years starting at 87% and will increase in a reasonable number by .5% to 1% for 2013 - 2018 APR.

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
351.00	437.00	87.01%	88.50%	80.32%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	77.90%	561.00
---	--------	--------

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

Reasons for Slippage

From FFY 2015 to FFY 2016 the Parent Coordinators of the Special Education Office of the ASDOE spent more time with the parents. We invited parents to go to their children's schools where we provided them with workshops on special education. During the workshops we talked about parents rights, IEP meetings, we explained IEP components and the services provided to their children. We distributed to all parents attending the workshops a booklet with their rights and the rights of their children as children with disabilities under IDEA. The workshops, workshop materials, and the booklets were spoken or written in English and Samoan.

On the parent surveys, we do offer a space for parents to write comments and suggestions for improvement or services and no parents chose to make any suggestion or recommendation for improvement in this year's survey.

Therefore, we can attribute this year's slippage due to parents being more informed and then more critical and of having higher expectations from special education in American Samoa. Although the result is negative in terms of being a slippage, we believe this is a path for better results in the future.

The survey questions that showed the largest decline from last year's parent survey to this year's were, in order of highest decline to lowest decline:

- 4) At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need.
- 23) The school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

24) The school provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.

5) All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.

1) I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program.

13) Teachers and administrators seek out parent input.

10) Written information I receive is written in an understandable way.

These are areas where we will prioritize for improvements in our future workshops for parents and school staff.

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.

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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2016: 80.32%

In the 2016-2017 school year, 80.32% of parents with a child receiving special education services reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a mean of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

# of survey send out	# of survey returned	# of Parents satisfied	% of satisfied Parents
561	437	351	80.32

The parent survey shows that the overall parental involvement rating is positive. These are surveys in which parents indicated that they "agree", "strongly agree", or "very strongly agree" with the questions .

Survey Distribution

In the Fall of 2016, 561 surveys were sent to parents of IEP students., ages 3-21 (Surveys are in English and in Samoan - please see attached). The Survey Packets were sent out to parents thru Resource Specialists and school staff. These Survey Packets included instruction on how to complete it and where to return them.

ASDOE-SPED continue to use the same survey packet as used in previous year. There were 25 items from NCSEAM'S Parent Survey that we selected to use for our survey.

Of the 561 parent survey distributed, 437 were completed and returned. This represents a return rate of 78%. The respondents are a representative sample of the special education population in American Samoa. Furthermore, the respondent families as well as all the target families are all Pacific Islanders (same race/ethnicity), therefore the respondents are representative of the target popullion.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Submitted survey: [Parent Survey American Samoa](#)

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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



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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
null	null	null		0%	

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define “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).

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.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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



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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
null	null	null		0%	

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

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).

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	93.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
120	120	100%	100%	100%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	0
---	---

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

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

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

Method used to collect data:

American Samoa has a database for collecting child find data. American Samoa has an assessment team 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 reports, and 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.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none
4/23/2018

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		67.00%	71.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	10
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	4
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	6
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	0
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	6	6	100%	100%	100%

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

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

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

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

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 Head Start by collecting data on Part C to Part B transitioning. 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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						98.80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
104	104	100%	100%	100%

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

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

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

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 173 IEPs in ASDOE during SY 2016-2017. Out of 173 IEPs, a total of 103 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, related services, community experiences, or development of employment and other post school objectives, and if appropriate acquisition 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?

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2014 APR is based on all of the files reviewed being in compliance with all of the eight components indicated above. For more detail please see the scoring rubric below that is used by the monitoring team.

American Samoa State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 13

Scoring Rubric Sheet for Indicator 13

Reviewer _____ Student Name _____ HS _____ Date _____

DOB _____ Age _____ Final Scoring (check one) Does not meet Requirement _____ Meet Requirement _____

Item 1 Requirements Yes/No/NA Notes

Does the IEP include a measurable post secondary goal for

- Education and/or Training _____
- Employment _____
- If appropriate, Independent Living _____

Prompts:

*Each postsecondary goal occurs **after** high school graduation/aging out

*Each postsecondary goal is measurable (e.g. can be counted)

Item 2 Requirements Yes/No/NA

Is the postsecondary goal updated annually?

- Education and/or Training _____
- Employment _____
- If appropriate, Independent Living _____

Prompts:

*Considering each postsecondary goal was the goal addressed or updated

in conjunction with the development of the current IEP?

Item 3 Requirements Yes/No/NA Notes

Is there evidence that the measurable postsecondary goals were based on age-appropriate transition assessment?

- Education and/or Training _____
- Employment _____
- If appropriate, Independent Living _____

Prompts:

*Did the transition assessments provide information on 'the students needs',

taking into account strengths, preferences, and interests regarding post-

secondary goals?

Item 4 Requirements Yes/No/NA Notes

For each postsecondary goal, is there a type of instruction, related services, community experiences, or development of employment and other post school objectives, and if appropriate acquisition of daily living skill(s), and provision of a functional vocational evaluation listed in association with meeting the postsecondary goal?

- Education and/or Training _____

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

• Employment _____

• If appropriate, Independent Living _____

Prompts:

*For each postsecondary goal, there is at least one transition service listed

that corresponds and connects to each postsecondary goal, and

*The student's IEP documents transition services that focus on improving

the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate their

movement from school to post school, and

*Transition services include academic and functional activities, supports

and services.

Item 5 Requirements Yes/No Notes

Does the IEP/ transition plan include a course of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals? _____

Prompts:

*Is the course of study aligned to the student's postsecondary goals?

*Does the course of study cover the student's remaining years in secondary education?

Item 6 Requirements Yes/No/NA Notes

Are there annual IEP goals that are related to the student's transition services needs?

• Education and/or Training _____

• Employment _____

• If appropriate, Independent Living _____

Prompts:

*For each postsecondary goal is there at least one annual goal and short term

objective included in the IEP related to the student's transition services needs?

Item 7 Requirements Yes/No Notes

Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed? _____

Prompts:

*For the current year, there is documentation in the IEP or cumulative folder that

the student was invited to attend the IEP meeting and

*The student invitation is signed (by the LEA) and dated prior to the date of the IEP meeting.

Item 8 Requirements Yes/No/NA Notes

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? _____

Prompts:

*Are there transition services listed that are likely to be provided or paid for by an outside

agency?

*If there are such services, is there documentation that the parent/guardian and/or student

Who has reached the age of majority has provided consent to invite the relevant outside agencies?

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

*If consent is obtained, is there evidence that one or more of the outside agencies /services were

invited to the IEP meeting to discuss transition?

*If it is too early to determine if the student will need outside agency involvement, an NA may be documented.

Student Transition Plan Requirements Meet/Does Not Meet Yes/NoNotes

Does the IEP meet the requirements of Indicator 13? _____

Prompts:

*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.

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

Yes No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							19.00%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%	23.00%
		Data						19.00%	15.56%	44.00%	30.00%	36.36%	29.55%
B	2009	Target ≥							33.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%
		Data						33.00%	46.67%	73.00%	55.00%	58.18%	61.36%
C	2009	Target ≥							48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%
		Data						48.00%	60.00%	80.00%	77.00%	76.36%	86.36%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	24.00%
	Data	15.00%
B	Target ≥	38.00%
	Data	70.00%
C	Target ≥	53.00%
	Data	82.50%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%
Target B ≥	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%
Target C ≥	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders provide input on the APR 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.

For indicator 14, targets for A, B, and C is set to a 1% increase from FFY2013 to FFY2018 APR.

FFY 2016 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	30.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	8.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	10.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	3.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

		who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	8.00	30.00	15.00%	25.00%	26.67%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	18.00	30.00	70.00%	39.00%	60.00%
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)	21.00	30.00	82.50%	54.00%	70.00%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

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

Was sampling used? No

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)

We reached the 30 students who were leavers in SY 2015-16 to measure their post school outcomes. Therefore, besides not using a sampling procedure, our census survey collected data from all leavers, making our data representative of our target population for this indicator.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0			0%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

FFY	2015
Target ≥	
Data	

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥			

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	0			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		4.00%	1.00%	2.00%
Data	4.00%	0%	50.00%	

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	3.00%	4.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

See Phase II attached as an attachment in PDF.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overview

Data Analysis

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

See attachment of the SSIP Document.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

See attachment of the SSIP document.

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

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

SIMR is attached with the SSIP document.

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

SSIP document attached.

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

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

See SSIP document attachment.

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

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

Evaluation

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

Technical Assistance and Support

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

Phase III submissions should include:

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

A. Summary of Phase 3

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

SSIP Phase III Attachment in PDF

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

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

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

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

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

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

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

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

See SSIP Phase III document attachment in PDF.

F. Plans for Next Year

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

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Leilani Maifea

Title: Compliance Officer

Email: lainuu@gmail.com

Phone: 684-770-9534