

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

American Samoa



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

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

In the past year, American Samoa received TA from the following OSEP funded centers: National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), IDEA Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSY), Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA), IDEA Data Center (IDC) and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR). NCSI hosts monthly webinars for the Pacific Entities, called Pacific Entities Learning Collaborative. On these webinars, we can interact with the other Pacific Entities, share and learn from each other, as well as hear presentations from TA providers from several centers, such as CIFR, IDC, NCII, NCIL, and Progress Center, among others.

In addition, the National Association of Special Education Directors (NASDSE) and the Councils of Chiefs State School Officers (CCSSO). The forms of TAs received and continuing are through webinars and conference calls.

American Samoa continues to be a member of the NASDSE association. The Special Education division has a representative in ASDOE's work with the CCSSO in Accountability and its effort in implementing change in its system.

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

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

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

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

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

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

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

Any formal complaints submitted to the ASDOE-SPED will be handled appropriately through the process of resolving disagreements as described in table below.

Informal Process

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

Formal Process

2

1. A complaint/disagreement must be put into writing, signed and dated prior to submission to the division 3 Part B
2. There will be an investigation of the problem by the division within 60 days or more depending on exceptional circumstances
3. Mediation may be requested with a third party to help resolve the disagreement if the problem is not solved after this
4. A formal request for a due process hearing may be submitted to the Director of the SPED.

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

Technical Assistance System:

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

Technical Assistance (TA) and training are critical for ensuring the implementation of IDEA requirements and assisting in identifying effective strategies to improve the performance and compliance of schools and programs.

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

ASDOE SPED received technical assistance from National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and ongoing monthly webinars and conference calls. ASDOE leaders were also able to participate in OSEP-funded TA virtual conferences throughout SY 2020-2021 and SY 2021-2022.

Professional Development System:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also establish to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

16

Parent Members Engagement:

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

A stakeholders meeting was held in January 2022, to discuss and set targets for FFY 2020-2025. Stakeholders were given a copy of each indicator with proposed targets. American Samoa discussed each indicator individually and stakeholders analyzed the data and provided input on the targets for each indicator.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

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

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

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

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

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

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

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

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

The FFY 2019 APR is found in the following link.
<https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-Untitled.html>

The FFY 2020 will be found in the same link once it is submitted (after final submission during clarification week). Previous APR submissions are also found in the same link.

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

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

American Samoa's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised American Samoa of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required American Samoa to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed American Samoa to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. American Samoa must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which American Samoa received assistance; and (2) the actions American Samoa took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

American Samoa's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed American Samoa that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which American Samoa received assistance; and (2) the actions it took as a result of that technical assistance. American Samoa provided the required information.

The Department imposed Specific Conditions on American Samoa's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years.

Intro - Required Actions

American Samoa's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the American Samoa's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	68.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Data	92.86%	100.00%	93.33%	95.83%	81.82%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

Stakeholders provided input on the graduation diplomas and making sure that all students are provided the opportunity to be able to graduate with a regular diploma. Therefore, they decided to keep the targets at 87%. They suggested to revisit the targets in a few years to see how ASDOE schools are progressing. They hope to be able to increase targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	30
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	3
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	4

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
30	37	81.82%	87.00%	81.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

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:

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

(Grad=Graduate with regular diploma, DO = Dropout, RC = Receive Certificate, RMA = Reached Maximum Age)

ASDOE does not have a state-defined alternate diploma.

In order to graduate with a regular diploma one must meet all requirements put forth by the American Samoa Department of Education.

**Students must obtain 20 credits provided that they pass all core courses:

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP changed the calculation for this indicator for FFY 2020. However, this new methodology now meets how ASDOE has been calculating this indicator since the beginning of the SPP/APR, since American Samoa does not submit ESEA data and had been using File 009 and the new methodology required for FFY 2020-25 since the first APR. Therefore, American Samoa did not change the baseline for this indicator.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

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

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	10.81%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Data	1.79%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.93%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	10.81%	10.70%	10.60%	10.50%	10.40%	10.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition

team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

Stakeholders expressed the concern of students with disabilities dropping out of school. They examined the data and suggested to keep the targets at 10.81 in FFY 2020 and decrease by 0.1% until FFY 2025. Stakeholders suggested that ASDOE put in place programs for students as such to alleviate the need of the child to want to drop out.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	30
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	3
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	4

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4	37	2.93%	10.81%	10.81%	N/A	N/A

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

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

1. student was not enrolled on September 1st of the school year although was expected to be in membership (i.e. was not reported as a drop out the year before), and
2. has not graduated from high school or completed a state- district approved educational program, and 11 Part B
3. did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - * moved known to continue
 - * transfer to another public school district or private school
 - * recognized absence due to suspension or illness
 - * death
 - * graduated with a diploma/received a certificate
 - * or reached maximum age This applies to all students within the educational setting (except for special education students where maximum age is 21 and regular education students maximum age 18).

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSEP has changed the methodology for calculating dropout rates for FFY 2020 and beyond. OSEP gives states the opportunity to continue using the former methodologies (called "Option 2" in the case of American Samoa) for another year before the state will need to change to the new methodology

in FFY 2021 (next APR). ASDOE proposes to already start with the new methodology, establishing a new baseline in FFY 2020. The ASDOE data team recalculated the last three years of data using the new methodology to help stakeholders provide input in the new targets.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	82.61%	90.00%	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	93.75%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	90.91%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.50%	93.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	80.56%	90.00%	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	91.67%	92.00%	92.50%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	97.44%	97.44%	97.44%	97.44%	97.44%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

Stakeholders agreed to the targets set targets start at a minimum of 90%, which is the minimum participation rate where American Samoa gets the highest score in its result driven accountability matrix.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	23	48	33
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	17	37	26
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1	6	0
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1	2	4

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	36	48	39
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	24	36	34
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2	6	0
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	3	2	4

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	19	23		82.61%	82.61%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	45	48		93.75%	93.75%	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	30	33		90.91%	90.91%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	29	36		80.56%	80.56%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	44	48		91.67%	91.67%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	38	39		97.44%	97.44%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

ASDOE FFY 2020 assessment results are found at this link:

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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

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

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	11.11%	11.50%	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%	13.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	23.26%	23.40%	23.50%	23.60%	23.70%	23.80%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	0.50%	1.00%	1.50%	2.00%	2.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	3.85%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	7.14%	7.50%	8.00%	8.50%	9.00%	9.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	0.50%	1.00%	1.50%	2.00%	2.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in

particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

Stakeholders agreed with setting targets that show small improvement for each of the six measures.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	18	43	26
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	6	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	4	0

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	26	42	34
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	1	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	2	18		11.11%	11.11%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	10	43		23.26%	23.26%	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	26		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1	26		3.85%	3.85%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	3	42		7.14%	7.14%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	34		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

ASDOE FFY 2020 assessment results are found at this link:
<https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-REPORTS.html>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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

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

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.50%	26.00%	26.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	66.67%	66.50%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also establish to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

Please note the very small number of students taking the alternate assessment. This is expected, since only students with severe cognitive impairments should take the alternate assessments. Stakeholders agreed that these baselines and targets may need to be revised as we observe how these students perform in alternate assessments in future years.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1	2	4
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1	2	1

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	3	2	4
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	2	2	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	1	1		100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2	2		100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1	4		25.00%	25.00%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2	3		66.67%	66.67%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2	2		100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	4		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

ASDOE FFY 2020 assessment results are found at this link:
<https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-REPORTS.html>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please note the very small number of students taking the alternate assessment. This is expected, since only students with severe cognitive impairments should take the alternate assessments. This means we will expect fluctuation on these data, considering we have such small number of students for each of these data cells. Please advise on privacy issues related to making this specific data available to the public.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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

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

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 3						
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	15.69	15.65	15.60	15.55	15.50	15.40
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	20.02	19.50	19.25	19.00	18.75	18.50
Math	A <=	Grade 4	9.15	9.00	8.50	8.00	7.50	7.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	2.87	2.50	2.25	2.00	1.75	1.50
Math	C <=	Grade HS	2.03	2.02	2.01	2.00	2.00	2.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each

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

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

The stakeholders thought the gap for math was too large but agreed on setting targets that are compatible with what they have set for indicator 3B. They were confused about students with disabilities performing better than all students in reading for grade three. We will monitor this data and invite stakeholders in subsequent years to revisit the targets should there be large change in proficiency rates.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	674	796	854
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	18	43	26
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	34	306	171
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	4	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	6	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	4	0

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	700	779	936
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	26	42	34
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	91	77	19
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	1	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0

f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	1	0
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---	---

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	11.11%	5.04%			-6.07	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	23.26%	38.94%		15.69	15.69	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0.00%	20.02%		20.02	20.02	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3.85%	13.00%		9.15	9.15	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	7.14%	10.01%		2.87	2.87	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0.00%	2.03%		2.03	2.03	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2020 data for 3D for Group A for reading, the value of the gap is -6.07. in other words special education students performed better than general education students in this indicator. Stakeholders proposed a baseline of -6.07 and targets of -6.08 , -6.08, -6.09, -6.09 and -6.1 (FFY 2020-2025). We were not able to enter the data in the APR tool which accepted only positive numbers.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

American Samoa has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

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

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa’s Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also establish to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa’s Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa’s Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Significant Discrepancy = _____ x 100 > _____ x 100

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

In school year 2020-2021, there were no students with disabilities who were suspended for greater than 10 days. Therefore there was no significant discrepancy for suspensions and expulsion for greater than 10 days in FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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.

American Samoa reviewed its policies, procedures and practices and changes were made to align with the changes happening with ASDOE internally. Policies and procedures were amended to make sure that the needs of students with disabilities were met. In doing so American Samoa has taken advantage of asking for help from technical assistance to make sure that the policies, procedures and practices align with federal law.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

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

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%	95.50%
A	83.30%	Data	88.96%	90.00%	89.15%	94.26%	89.42%
B	2020	Target <=	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	1.50%	1.50%
B	8.35%	Data	4.22%	4.56%	5.01%	0.00%	0.00%
C	2020	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%
C	0.40%	Data	0.32%	0.53%	0.33%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	83.30%	83.50%	84.00%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%
Target B <=	8.35%	8.30%	8.25%	8.20%	8.15%	8.10%
Target C <=	0.40%	0.40%	0.40%	0.40%	0.40%	0.35%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

ASDOE, together with its stakeholders, agreed on a new baseline for this indicator, since the original baseline and targets were considered unrealistic to be achieved. ASDOE and stakeholders proposed FFY 2020 as the new baseline and set targets that are ambitious, yet achievable based on the performance of the last several years.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	503
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	419
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	42
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	2

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	419	503	89.42%	83.30%	83.30%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	42	503	0.00%	8.35%	8.35%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2	503	0.00%	0.40%	0.40%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ASDOE, together with its stakeholders, agreed on a new baseline for this indicator, since the original baseline and targets were considered unrealistic to be achieved. ASDOE and stakeholders proposed FFY 2020 as the new baseline and set targets that are ambitious, yet achievable based on the performance of the last several years.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

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

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B	Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

ASDOE, together with its stakeholders, agreed on a new baseline for indicator 6, because this is a new measurement. ASDOE and stakeholders proposed FFY 2020 as the new baseline and set targets that are ambitious, yet achievable.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	13	28	0	41
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	13	28	0	41
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	0	0	0	0

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

NO

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	41	41	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	41	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	0	41		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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

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

American Samoa reported fewer than ten children receiving special education and related services in the home in FFY 2020. American Samoa is not required to meet its targets for Indicator 6C until any fiscal year in which ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2020	Target >=	93.80%	94.30%	94.80%	94.80%	94.80%
A1	63.64%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%
A2	2009	Target >=	73.90%	74.40%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%

A2	71.40%	Data	91.67%	83.33%	76.19%	91.67%	75.00%
B1	2009	Target >=	75.20%	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%	76.20%
B1	72.70%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	81.82%	100.00%	100.00%
B2	2009	Target >=	57.60%	58.10%	58.60%	58.60%	58.60%
B2	55.10%	Data	91.67%	83.33%	71.43%	91.67%	75.00%
C1	2020	Target >=	75.20%	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%	76.20%
C1	75.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	90.91%	100.00%	100.00%
C2	2020	Target >=	53.50%	54.00%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%
C2	50.00%	Data	95.83%	91.67%	76.19%	95.83%	75.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	63.64%	64.10%	64.60%	65.10%	65.60%	66.10%
Target A2 >=	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%
Target B1 >=	76.70%	77.20%	77.70%	78.20%	78.70%	79.20%
Target B2 >=	59.10%	59.60%	60.10%	60.60%	61.10%	61.60%
Target C1 >=	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%
Target C2 >=	50.00%	50.50%	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%	52.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

The stakeholders looked at the data for each indicator within preschool outcomes and based on historical data suggested new baselines for 7A1, 7C1, and 7C2. ASDOE and stakeholders agreed this is an opportunity to set realistic targets that are also ambitious.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

22

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4	18.18%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1	4.55%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	27.27%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	11	50.00%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7	11	80.00%	63.64%	63.64%	N/A	N/A
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	17	22	75.00%	75.00%	77.27%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3	13.64%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4	18.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	27.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	9	40.91%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	10	13	100.00%	76.70%	76.92%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	15	22	75.00%	59.10%	68.18%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4	18.18%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7	31.82%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	22.73%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	27.27%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	12	16	100.00%	75.00%	75.00%	N/A	N/A
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	11	22	75.00%	50.00%	50.00%	N/A	N/A

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The stakeholders looked at the data for each indicator within preschool outcomes and based on historical data suggested new baselines for 7A1, 7C1, and 7C2. ASDOE and stakeholders agreed this is an opportunity to set realistic targets that are also ambitious.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

American Samoa has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 for sub-indicators A1, C1, and C2, and OSEP accepts those revisions, however, OSEP would expect that all summary statements would use a consistent baseline year.

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

7 - Required Actions

American Samoa has provided baselines using data from FFY 2009 for A2, B1, and B2, and using data from FFY 2020 for A1, C1, and C2. American Samoa must revise baselines to use data from the same year across summary statements in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, and with stakeholder input, revise any targets as appropriate to ensure the FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement over baseline.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

ASDOE and stakeholders agreed to continue with the previous years' targets. The parent survey is being modified which will require this indicator to have a new baseline in FFY 2021 and subsequent targets.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	66.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	88.00%	88.50%	89.00%	89.50%	89.50%
Data	87.01%	80.32%	90.85%	91.03%	84.35%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
378	511	84.35%	89.50%	73.97%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The survey questions where parents rated engaged the lowest were related to special assistance to parents to participate in the IEP meeting, the participation on the statewide assessments, accommodations the child would need, written justification for the extent that their child would receive services in the regular classroom. This lower rating this year could be explained by the challenges schools had, which is the impact of COVID 19. Parents are located in remote villages, without internet services or other communications, were not engaged with the school activities the same way they usually participate in normal time.

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.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

544

Percentage of respondent parents

93.93%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	86.30%	93.93%

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

No groups were underrepresented. There was an increase in the response rate from 86.3% in FFY 2019 to 93.93% in FFY 2020. To maintain such a high return rate, American Samoa is modifying the survey to have less than 10 questions and with more appropriate questions for the families of our students.

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

The response rate for the parents survey in FFY 2020 was 93.93%, which is an improvement from the 86.30% return rate in FFY 2019. There was no nonresponse bias in the responding population, using the +/- 3% discrepancy to measure the proportion of responders and comparing it to the target group, measuring race/ethnicity as the key demographic characteristic. The respondents and population were from the same race-ethnicity, that is, 100% of the target population and 100% of respondents were "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" race/ethnicity. Applying the -3/+3% means the respondents were at 0% discrepancy, there was no nonresponse bias in the responding population.

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

ASDOE used the +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group to measure response rates and identify any potential nonresponse bias, measuring race/ethnicity as the key demographic characteristic. The respondents and the target population were from the same race-ethnicity, that is, 100% of target population and 100% of respondents were of the "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" race/ethnicity. Applying the -3/+3% this means the respondents were at 0% discrepancy, therefore there was no nonresponse bias in the responding population. For FFY 2021, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, besides race/ethnicity its analysis, ASDOE will include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category.

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

YES

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

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

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

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

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
137	133	100.00%	100%	97.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

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

4

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

Student A was 27 days late
 Student B was 40 days late
 Student C was 30 days late
 Student D was 60 days late

The reason for the delay was a new staff member who took an absence of leave to take care of an ill family member and did not return to work to complete the evaluation of these four students.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Method used to collect data:

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because American Samoa reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, American Samoa must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, American Samoa must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, American Samoa must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If American Samoa did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why American Samoa did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	67.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	11
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	0

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	11
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	0
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	11	11	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	98.80%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
83	83	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%
A	10.81%	Data	15.00%	26.67%	53.33%	12.50%	31.43%
B	2020	Target >=	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	41.00%
B	45.95%	Data	70.00%	60.00%	90.00%	50.00%	48.57%
C	2009	Target >=	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%
C	48.00%	Data	82.50%	70.00%	96.67%	100.00%	80.00%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	45.95%	46.50%	47.00%	47.50%	48.00%	48.50%
Target B >=	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%
Target C >=	80.00%	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa’s Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa’s Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each

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

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

ASDOE and stakeholders agreed to change the baseline for 14A and 14B to make them more realistic with the current economic situation. The pandemic has affected post-school outcomes especially regarding college registration and competitive employment. The ASDOE will monitor this data and should the economy improve and students' post-school outcomes improve substantially beyond the improvement efforts of schools ASDOE will organize the stakeholders and reset targets.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	37
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	37
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	4
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	13
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)	11
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).	9

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	4	37	31.43%	45.95%	10.81%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	17	37	48.57%	80.00%	45.95%	N/A	N/A
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)	37	37	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

ASDOE Staff contacts all students and families through emails and phone calls to get data on the post-school outcomes of students with disabilities within a year after graduating.

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

With a response rate of 100%, the respondents being the same group as the target population, there was no nonresponse bias identified.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

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

YES

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

American Samoa has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, for sub-indicator A and sub-indicator B, and OSEP accepts those revisions.

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

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

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

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

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 a baseline, targets, and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

American Samoa reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. American Samoa is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

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

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

American Samoa reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. American Samoa is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

To increase the percentage of students with disabilities who will be proficient in reading as measured by Standard Based Assessment (SBA) in the third grade (3rd grade) on the five pilot schools that are implementing the Dual Language Program for students with disabilities.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

American Samoa Grants and Reports Link: <https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-REPORTS.html>

American Samoa Theory of Action direct link: <https://www.doe.as/files/user/47/file/Theory%20of%20Action.pdf>

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

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The Dual Language program will be substituted by the Early Literacy Skills Initiative (ELSI). This will change the main strategies of American Samoa's SSIP, the evidence based practices, the interim data and the schools who will be in the pilot program.

The K-3 ELSI programs are the Read Well K, 1, 2 and 3 (Voyager Sopris Learning/ Acadience); Language for Learning (McGraw Hill) and Acadience Assessment (formerly known as DIBELS-Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills).

Both programs are daily Direct Instruction which is scripted. There will be a 2 hour block w/Language for Learning taught the first 30 minutes daily, followed by the Read Well (SPED teachers were trained to Double Dose-repeat of what was taught during reading w/their students).

Interim assessments (progress towards the SiMR) will be the Acadience assessment which is comprised of 1 minute fluency assessments administered 3 times a year (Fall, Winter & Spring); and Progress Monitoring is being recommended for our SPED students.

The SiMR measurement is not going to change, just the main strategy and the pilot schools. American Samoa will still be measuring the performance of 3rd grade students with disabilities in reading proficiency using the statewide assessment as a measure of proficiency in participating schools.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	18.18%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target> =	18.18%	19.00%	19.50%	20.00%	20.50%	21.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

The number of third grade students with disabilities who were proficient in the SBA (statewide assessment in reading) in the five pilot schools.	The number of students with disabilities in the third grade in the five pilot schools.	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2	11		18.18%	18.18%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The data source is the Office of Testing and Evaluation for American Samoa Department of Education (ASDOE).

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

The data is collected through the Office of Testing and Evaluation as part of the statewide assessment initiative. They provide the assessment data by school and grade to the Integrated Data System's Office where the data is entered in the database (Student Information System). The data manager retrieves the reading performance data from the database and calculates the proficiency rates for the pilot schools.

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

YES

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

The additional data ASDOE collects are the Dual Language (DL) program's own DL-SBA pre and post assessment. The pre-test takes place in September-October every school year. The post-test is conducted annually in April-May. The DL SBA pre and post data measures student outcomes on K5 – 3 from the five pilot schools. ASDOE also collects two vocabulary measures used by the DL program, the SPVT and SEPVT, to examine how the students are progressing through the system in the pilot schools, within and outside the SSIP/SiMR group.

Other data sources collected include fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices, quality of IEPs, surveys from participants of professional development activities, and information collected during PDSA with SSIP stakeholder activities.

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

American Samoa evaluation plan direct link: <https://www.doe.as/files/user/47/file/American%20Samoa%20SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan.pdf>

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

NO

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

Professional development:

The DL office continued to implement training for teachers (regular and special education) to use the DL curriculum, its lesson plan book, the administration of its pre and post-assessment tests. ASDOE Dual language program trained one program coordinator to become a coach and mentor to special education teachers in participating schools.

IEP Goals & Objectives:

The SSIP Core team and consultants continue to conduct IEP training for teachers (regular and special education), principals, resource specialists, parents, and the school-based team on the revised IEP manual, and the IEP rubric. The program coordinator trains the teachers in the five schools on writing PLAAFP's and SMART goals on the IEP.

Parent Involvement:

Training for parents was held by pilot schools on campus throughout the school year. Parents were also part of the bigger stakeholders' meetings sharing their student progress and testimonies on milestones they have seen since the implementation of the program. The DL office continued to employ parents as teachers assistants in the classroom.

Collaboration with General Education:

There continues to be a collaboration between General ed and special ed teachers on all training. Ongoing technical support on professional development for the IEP manual, rubric, and student accommodations occur throughout the school year. SPED continues to organize and involve stakeholders through meetings and training.

Monitoring and Accountability:

The SSIP core team manages all implementation activities for its school-based team and external stakeholders. SPED continues to evaluate the implementation of activities through evaluation surveys and shares results with stakeholders for their feedback so upcoming activities can be adjusted if applicable.

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

American Samoa applied the IEP rubric on a sample of IEPs and observed improvement in the quality of IEPs.

Survey results and direct testimony indicate parents have increased awareness and knowledge of SSIP and the Dual Language programs. Parents gained new skills and confidence in their abilities to help participate in the IEP meeting and development. Parents gained new skills and confidence in their abilities to contribute to their child's education Collaboration.

Professional Development: Teachers acquired new knowledge and skills of DL curriculum (including EBPs) Teachers (regular and special education) develop meaningful instructional lesson plans. Teachers (regular and special education) learned how to implement pre-tests to identify students' weaknesses and strengths, and post-tests to determine if students mastered the goal.

IEP Goals and Objectives: Teachers implemented appropriate, individual instruction to students with disabilities based on the students' IEPs. Teachers were able to measure student progress towards their SMART goals and objectives (IEP).

Parent Involvement: Parents have increased awareness and knowledge of the SSIP and Dual Language program. Parents gained new skills and confidence in their abilities to help participate in the IEP meeting and development. Parents gained new skills and confidence in their abilities to contribute to their child's education.

Collaboration General and Special Education: General and special education staff learned to co-plan, design joint instructional practice General Education staff will learn about IEP development and implementation, and student accommodation. General and SPED staff gained communication strategy among pilot schools, SSIP Core Team, DL Program staff, Office of Curriculum and Instruction. Improved dual language program and instruction delivered by general and special education teachers

Clarity of roles and accountability on the implementation of the Dual Language program and the SSIP activities. SSIP activities are implemented by SSIP Core Team and the appropriate stakeholders for their respective activities. Improve/modify activities for the implementation of the SSIP.

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

NO

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

American Samoa is the process of changing its main strategies for the SSIP. The SSIP team with its stakeholders are revising the theory of action by keeping the five strands but changing the activities and strategies. All of these changes will be in the next SSIP FFY 2021.

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

The evidence based practices implemented in the five pilot schools in the reporting period were:

- 1) Teacher Training
- 2) Thematic Unit in Lesson planning
- 3) Lesson plan in Constructive Model
- 4) Instructional Materials in Native Language
- 5) Assessment in Pre-Post Testing
- 6) Individual Student Progress Data Portfolio and Teacher Learning and Teacher Support Assessment

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The SSIP team and the DL program continue to use the following evidence-based practices (EBP):

1) Teacher Training (training with DL strategies, and the use of first language to teach lessons). The DL program describes the times for medium of instruction from K-12th grade. For early years, K3-K5: 95% in Samoan and 5% in English, Level 1: 90% Samoan and 10% English, Level 2: 80% in Samoan, 20% in English, Level 3: 70% in Samoan and 30% in English.

2) Thematic Units in Lesson Planning. Foundational skills described in the ASDOE content standards and benchmarks on literacy, based on the building blocks of literacy- concepts of print, letter recognition, phonological awareness, phonics and phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

3) Lesson plan formatted in Constructive Model (I do (Teacher Model), We do (Guided practice), You do (Individual practice)).

4) Instructional Materials in Native Language (unit and lesson plans in Samoan language, standards and benchmark book in Samoan language, curriculum guide, reading materials in Samoan).

5) Assessment in Pre-Post Testing (Vocabulary Tests in English and Samoan Language (Samoan English Picture Vocabulary Test-SEPVT, Samoan Picture Vocabulary Test-SPVT), Standard Based Test.

6) Individual Student Progress Data Portfolio and Teacher Learning and Teacher Support Assessment. In School Year 2017-18 the student portfolios were implemented and continued in SY 2018-19, SY 2019-20 and SY 2020-21.

These EBPs are designed to improve the literacy foundations of students who are not English language proficient. The gradual approach from Samoan (native language of more than 90% of the students) to English, together with designed delivery methods are expected to positively impact students' literacy rates by third grade.

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

The SSIP team and the DL program continue to use the following evidence-based practices (EBP):

- 1) Teacher Training (training with DL strategies, and the use of first language to teach lessons). By training the teachers to implement the DL program, students with disabilities are provided a rich environment and resources. This allows the teacher to provide the structure and function necessary to provide the educational needs of students which in turn impacts the SiMR. Teaching in the student's native language and gradually including English in their curriculum and materials allows students to be more engaged in the learning process.
- 2) Thematic Units in Lesson Planning outlines a structure the teacher uses to follow in order to help students with disabilities learn. The concepts as described allow the teacher to teach so that the child moves closer to their intended learning outcome.
- 3) Lesson plan formatted in Constructive Model (I do (Teacher Model), We do (Guided practice), You do (Individual practice)). This model allows the student to observe how the task is done before the intended seat work that is done individually. Showing the students how to complete the task gives the child more practice before completing the task individually.
- 4) Instructional Materials in Native Language (unit and lesson plans in Samoan language, standards and benchmark book in Samoan language, curriculum guide, reading materials in Samoan). The instructional material in the student's native language and gradually including English gives a more concrete understanding of what is expected and move towards being proficient.
- 5) Assessment in Pre-Post Testing (Vocabulary Tests in English and Samoan Language (Samoan English Picture Vocabulary Test-SEPVT, Samoan Picture Vocabulary Test-SPVT), Standard Based Test. These assessments pre and post help track the students learning outcomes and progress throughout the school year.
- 6) Individual Student Progress Data Portfolio and Teacher Learning and Teacher Support Assessment. The portfolios help provide evidence and track the student's progress based on his or her IEP.

These EBPs are designed to improve the literacy foundations of students who are not English language proficient. The gradual approach from Samoan (the native language of more than 90% of the students) to English, together with designed delivery methods are expected to positively impact students' literacy rates by third grade.

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

ASDOE uses two methods to calculate fidelity of implementation of EBPs. One is a measure of teacher performance, the other is a measure of implementation of the student portfolio tool.

ASDOE uses two methods to calculate the fidelity of implementation of EBPs. One is a measure of teacher performance, the other is a measure of implementation of the student portfolio tool.

The Teacher Performance Evaluation System (TPES) consists of four comprehensive and integrated components. For the SSIP ASDOE used 20 items related to the teacher observations component that provides the most adequate measure of the implementation of evidence-based practices. These 20 questions are subdivided into five areas: teachers planning and preparation; content, knowledge, skills and language of the discipline; teachers Pedagogy; teachers use of language & learning; and assessment: formative & summative.

The overall rate on the TPES was 88.6% fidelity of implementation, which was an improvement from FFY 2017 (72.5%), FFY 2018 (70.05%), and FFY 2019 (79%). Teachers of the five pilot schools were rated at 100% on planning and preparation, 89% on content, knowledge, skills, and language of the discipline, 91% on pedagogy, 86% on language and learning, and 82% on evaluation of formative and summative student assessments. Overall, the schools ranged from 87.5% fidelity of implementation (Tafuna Elementary) to 90.5% (Pavaiai). These data will be used to design next year's professional development activities.

The second measure of fidelity is related to the implementation of components of Student Portfolios, which measures students' implementation of the IEPs, student progress in achieving their goals, and how teachers (general and special education) discuss each student's progress in relation to the specially designed instruction.

Overall, all schools were at 96.3% fidelity of implementation of the 9 components of the student portfolio in FFY 2020. Schools ranged from 91.1% at Pavaiai to 96.3% in Leone Midkiff. In FFY 2019 the overall fidelity of implementation of the 9 components of the student portfolio was 86%.

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

American Samoa collected additional data by using students' portfolios and teacher evaluations Student portfolios were graded based on an individual Student Progress Data Portfolio checklist. The checklist consists of 9 items (Student Information, IEP PLAAFP, IEP SMART Goals, Pre Assessment, Post Assessment, Progress Measures, Statewide Assessment & Accommodations, Measuring Student Progress, and Teacher Learning and Support Assessment.

ASDOE's teacher evaluation is the Teacher Performance Evaluation System which consists of four comprehensive and integrated components designed to identify teacher strengths and challenges. The Teacher Evaluation Team (TET) determined the four components to be critical factors. These four components are student work samples reflecting effective teaching, teacher professional teaching portfolio, teacher attendance, and classroom observation evaluation.

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

The Dual Language program will be substituted by the Early Literacy Skills Initiative (ELSI). This will change the main strategies of American Samoa's SSIP, the evidence based practices, the interim data and the schools who will be in the pilot program.

The K-3 ELSI programs are the Read Well K, 1, 2 and 3 (Voyager Sopris Learning/ Acadience); Language for Learning (McGraw Hill) and Acadience Assessment (formerly known as DIBELS-Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills).

Both programs are daily Direct Instruction which is scripted. There will be a 2 hour block w/Language for Learning taught the first 30 minutes daily, followed by the Read Well (SPED teachers were trained to Double Dose-repeat of what was taught during reading w/their students).

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

American Samoa's Special Education Division team established a team to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. An advisory council was also established to provide feedback from the community, serve as advocate for the division to the community.

American Samoa's Planning Team was established to discuss and guide the development of the six-year State Performance Plan. The State Director of Special Education chaired the Planning team. Orientation for the Planning Team members was provided with information from the Office of Special Education and NCSI (National Center for Systemic Improvement). The Planning Team is divided into SSIP team, monitoring team, APR team, transition team, general supervision team, private schools team and leadership team. Team Leaders and Facilitators provided ongoing guidance for each workgroup during the SPP and SSIP process. American Samoa's Planning Team also received technical assistance from the NCSI and DaSy during the SPP and SSIP development.

The planning team also works with a broad-based stakeholders group and that provided input into the development of the SPP and SSIP. This year in particular this broad-based group of stakeholders provided input and setting the targets for all results indicators and the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR. The group of stakeholders include ASDOE personnel (elementary, secondary, special education), the AS Special Education Advisory Council, private schools, Head Start, parents and other government agencies.

ASDOE held a meeting during the SPP process including the SSIP. A powerpoint presentation was viewed by stakeholders that included all result indicators. Each indicator was allocated time for the stakeholders to analyze the data and provide input on suggested targets.

On January 26, 2022, the Division held a stakeholder meeting in an effort to set targets for the SSIP. The stakeholders provided feedback through conversations and questionnaires pertaining to the targets of the SSIP. Stakeholders agreed to the targets. Overall stakeholders, including parents, are given the opportunity to be part of the SSIP implementation. They participate on teacher trainings and creation of materials such as big books in the native language. They have also the opportunity to provide feedback on the progress of implementation of the SSIP via Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) sessions together with teachers and other stakeholders.

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

Overall stakeholders, including parents, are given the opportunity to be part of the SSIP implementation. They participate on teacher trainings and creation of materials such as big books in the native language. They have also the opportunity to provide feedback on the progress of implementation of the SSIP via Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) sessions together with teachers and other stakeholders.

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

NO

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

The Dual Language program will be substituted by the Early Literacy Skills Initiative (ELSI). This will change the main strategies of American Samoa's SSIP, the evidence based practices, the interim data and the schools who will be in the pilot program.

The K-3 ELSI programs are the Read Well K, 1, 2 and 3 (Voyager Sopris Learning/ Acadience); Language for Learning (McGraw Hill) and Acadience Assessment (formerly known as DIBELS-Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills).

Both programs are daily Direct Instruction which is scripted. There will be a 2 hour block w/Language for Learning taught the first 30 minutes daily, followed by the Read Well (SPED teachers were trained to Double Dose-repeat of what was taught during reading w/their students).

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

This new program (ELSI) is being implemented in school year 2021-2022. This first year is going to be a baseline year for activities and outcomes. The new program is starting with grades K-1, therefore the impact on the SiMR, which is grade 3 performance on reading proficiency, is not anticipated until this cohort of students reach grade 3.

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

It is not a barrier but it is a new challenge to embark on a new program. The SSIP team and stakeholders are excited about the prospects of the new program. ASDOE will develop a new theory of action and evaluation tools. Training will have to be set and the selection of schools would need to be introduced to the planning phase for the new SSIP FFY-2021.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

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

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

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

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:

Herbert Boat Jr

Title:

Special Education Director

Email:

herbert.boat@doe.as

Phone:

6846331323

Submitted on:

04/26/22 4:32:55 PM