FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). (Please limit your response to 785 characters without space)*.*

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

If "Yes", provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*.*

Stakeholders encouraged the American Samoa Department of Education (ASDOE) to expand the pilot program so more school staff and students could benefit from participating in the SSIP. ASDOE has been preparing to scale up the SSIP work for the last two years and in FFY 2019 was able to scale up and add two more schools to its SSIP pilot program. These schools are included in all SSIP activities in the current reporting period, including all SSIP stakeholder meetings.

The Dual Language (DL) program is piloting eight schools in which three schools had been participating in the SSIP, ASDOE had a pool of five more schools to consider for scaling up. To make a decision on which of the five schools would join the SSIP Pilot Program, ASDOE stakeholders looked at the IEP counts of each school for each level from K5-L3. The objective was to select larger schools that can include the largest possible number of students in the SSIP Pilot program. ASDOE stakeholders also considered the commitment of principals, education specialists, and parent involvement in candidate schools in their decision-making process. The five schools in the SSIP pilot program are now: Pava'ia'i, Uifa'atali Peter Coleman and Tafuna elementary schools, which are the three original pilot schools, now added by Leone Midkiff and Manulele elementary schools.

New baseline will be calculated when data is available (SY 2020-21 data) and ASDOE staff and stakeholders will set targets accordingly.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data: 0%

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission?   No

FFY 2018 Target: 4%   **FFY 2019 Target**: 5%

FFY 2018 Data: 69.2% (9/13)   **FFY 2019 Data:**   Data not available due to COVID-19

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met?   No

Did slippage[1] occur? No

If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

The American Samoa Department of Education (ASDOE) did not implement the statewide assessment in SY 2019-20.

ASDOE will implement the SY 2020-21 statewide assessment, which is scheduled to take place on May 11th to May 20th, 2021. When these data become available, ASDOE will calculate a new baseline because of the inclusion of two new schools in the SSIP pilot program. ASDOE, together with its stakeholders, will also generate a set of new targets for the duration of the next SSIP cycle.

---

[1] The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:
1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
    a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
    b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
    a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
    b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* **that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR?** Yes

If "Yes", describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*.*

Under normal circumstances ASDOE collects additional data (below). However, due to the Measles outbreak and the COVID-19 pandemic, only a partial set of these data were collected (The Dual Language (DL) Program SBA pre assessment).

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. These data were collected in FFY 2019 and are included in the narrative of the SSIP.

Did the State identify any provide describe of general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period?
 No

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

If "Yes", describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

Click or tap here to enter text.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? Yes

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

1. Impact on data completeness, validity and reliability: Because of the pandemic, the American Samoa Department of Education canceled the implementation of the statewide SBA and DL SBA for SY 2019-2020.
2. How COVID Impacted data collection? In the school year 2019-2020, American Samoa was unable to collect SIMR data because of the measles outbreak that started in December 2019 followed by the COVID 19 pandemic that started in Spring of 2020. The American Samoa Government issued a Code Blue (minimal social disruption with an emphasis on social distancing, hygiene and cough etiquette) as a preventative measure for COVID-19. As a result of the Code Blue, all American Samoan Government departments, including the ASDOE, were to stagger staffing coverage and required to use a 4-day workweek for employees — 10 hours per day — to ensure sufficient coverage but limited interpersonal exposure. The progression of precautionary measures regarding the pandemic eventually led to the closure of schools and temporary cancellation of all activities, including the cancellation of the Statewide Assessments (SBA).
3. ASDOE continued to implement the SSIP and was able to collect data related to the fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices, and the evaluation of professional development activities (training events). At the start of SY 2020-21 activities were resumed as normal. For the next SSIP submission, American Samoa will be able to collect the SIMR data and all data required to measure progress on SIMR and the implementation of the SSIP. The SBA is scheduled for May 10 to May 14, 2021.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission?   No

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).
Click or tap here to enter text.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? No

If "Yes", describe each <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*.*

Click or tap here to enter text.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State <u>continued</u> to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

During the FFY 2019 SSIP period, the ASDOE implemented all 20 SSIP yearly and ongoing infrastructure improvement activities as described in the SSIP plan and reported for the last five years.

Pilot schools received training from the SSIP team in collaboration with the Dual Language (DL) team targeting general and special education teachers, and school administrators. These professional development activities covered DL program resources (lesson plans, curriculum standards, pre- and post-testing materials in Samoan language, protocols for observing teachers and mentoring/coaching). It covered highlights of the SSIP activities, the IEP process, the implementation of student portfolios, and the tools to measure the fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices. It covered the five strands of the ASDOE SSIP Theory of Action. Overall, training materials were revised based on what was learned from last year's PDSA.

Following training events, SSIP core team visited the pilot schools, and the SSIP core team staff and DL teams mentored and coached new teachers. The DL team also delivered after-school training to new general and special education teachers. The school principals and vice principals participated in these training sessions.

A three-week DL program mentor training, hosted by the Office of Curriculum Instruction (OCI) DL team followed the initial training. The mentor training (Gagana Taumualua Mentor) was implemented in November 2020 and February 2021. Trainers included the DL team, OCI-leader with OCI coordinators, SSIP DL representative, and Elementary Division leaders. Curriculum included ASDOE curriculum, lesson planning, the pre-and post-testing materials, and how to become an effective DL mentor teacher. The audience were lead teachers from all eight pilot schools, all DL new teachers and the special education teachers. The training involved the co-development (trainers and trainees) of a mentoring handbook with a collection of good practices in supporting mentors and mentees to promote quality education for all students regardless of their abilities. This handbook resource is now available as an outcome of this training. This activity was a collaboration between OCI, the DL program, and the SSIP core team and is an ongoing process.

Parent training took place for volunteer parents to provide assistance to teachers in the classrooms. This two-day training for the parents of students in grade levels K5 to Level 3 took place in September 2020 and was delivered by the SSIP and the DL teams. The objectives for the training were to equip parents (including parents of students with disabilities) to learn about the ASDOE curriculum, the lesson planning components, and the DL strategies for all students. An outcome was a co-developed (participating parents and trainers) parent resource manual consisting of songs, poems, and tusi tala pupu'u (short stories) in Samoan language. The training prepared parents to work as teacher aides assisting teachers in pilot schools. This initiative was supported by the OCI DL team.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The evaluation of training activities are measured by student progress on the SIMR and other measures associated with the SIMR, such as the DL program pre- and post-assessments, and the interim vocabulary assessments (SPVT and SEPVT). We also evaluate our progress by measuring the quality of IEPs (IEP rubric), summarizing training events evaluation results, the analysis of fidelity of implementation of EBPs, and student portfolio progress monitoring of students' IEP goals.

Because of the Measles outbreak in late 2019 and the COVID-19 pandemic in the spring of 2020, some of this year's progress measures were not available (statewide assessment that measures the SIMR, pre-and post-assessments, SPVT, SEPVT). Our evaluation progress will therefore be measured by the summary of training events evaluation, fidelity of implementation of best practices, teacher observations, and other qualitative observations based on the implementation of this year's PDSA with stakeholders. At this section of the SSIP we will only report the PDSA results and the training evaluation.

The SSIP team worked on what we learned from our annual PDSA activity which is our overall progress monitoring tool for the SSIP implementation. For example, as a result of the PDSA, the DL team and the SSIP representative scheduled joint-planning SSIP activities to improve collaboration and plan improvement activities. It included refinements to the SSIP activities, especially the training of teachers, parents and the school administrators which were a result of the team's PDSA reflections.

Stakeholders discussed what was learned from accomplishments and challenges of teachers in relation to students outcomes as measured by testing results in last year's SSIP. Team members designed solutions that helped create, for example, new lesson plans and planning of more outreaching professional developments for teachers. These refinements were incorporated in the FFY 2019 SSIP training events.

All professional development activities were evaluated. 37 teachers from the five pilot schools responded to surveys rating the training they received. 11 survey questions asked participants to rate from poor (1), good (3) and very good (5) how the activity's objectives were defined, if their participation was encouraged, whether topics covered were relevant to them, whether the training objectives were met. All 37 teachers rated all questions at the maximum level (very good). When asked what they liked most about the training, the majority of respondents indicated they liked the data, seeing their schools' performance, and learning more about the SSIP.

Seven participating parents (at least one from each school) also answered the same survey. Their responses were rated between good and very good (92%, almost very good which would be 100%). The area parents struggled the most was related to the relevancy of the training with respect to their work, which makes sense since they participate in the Pilot program as volunteers and in a limited basis.

The calendar of activities between the DL program and the SSIP core team indicates all coaching/mentoring sessions took place according to schedule.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space)**:**

The ASDOE plans to continue implementing the same ongoing infrastructure strategies that have been implemented in the last several years.

The FFY 2019 SSIP was an atypical year because of the December 2019 Measles outbreak followed by the Spring of 2020 COVID-19 outbreak. We made changes to how we deliver services based on the American Samoa's statewide declaration of public health emergency and state of emergency for COVID-19.

American Samoa's preventative actions resulted in no COVID-19 infections. Now, with the undergoing of mass vaccinations, American Samoa is resuming normal activities. SY 2020-21 is back to normal, the SBA tests (statewide assessments) are scheduled to take place from May 10th to the 14th, and service delivery is back to normal in all schools, including the SSIP pilot schools.

During the SY 2021-22, a decision will be made related to the Dual Language program, which is a main component of the ASDOE SSIP. The ASDOE is considering the reintroduction of the Reading First initiative of several years ago, which may be implemented alongside the Dual Language Program. Changes may take place on how we are structured to operate and implement the SSIP based on what decisions are made regarding the Dual Language program. This will be reported in the next SSIP, after we engage with stakeholders and make decisions about how to proceed.

The major infrastructure change that took place in SY 2019-20 was the incorporation of two new schools in the SSIP pilot program. This process has been a gradual and evolving process, with discussions starting in FFY 2017, schools being partially incorporated in the FFY 2018 SSIP and fully implemented in the FFY 2019 SSIP. There are no discussions for scaling up to incorporate new schools in the pilot program for future years of the SSIP at this time.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?   No

If "Yes", describe the selection process for the <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Provide a summary of the <u>continued</u> evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

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 and SY 2019-20.

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.

Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

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.

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 79% fidelity of implementation, which was an improvement from FFY 2017 (72.5%) and FFY 2018 (70.05%). Teachers of the five pilot schools were rated at 86.8% on planning and preparation, 78% on content, knowledge, skills and language of the discipline, 78.2% on pedagogy, 80% on

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

language and learning, and 78.7% on evaluation of formative and summative student assessments. Overall, the schools ranged from 73.8% fidelity of implementation (Pavaiai) to 93.3% (Leone Midkiff). 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 relationship to the specially designed instruction.

Overall, all schools were at 86% fidelity of implementation of the 9 components of the student portfolio. Schools ranged from 82% at Manulele to 100% in Leone Midkiff. The three pilot schools in FFY 2018 ranged from 84% to 92%.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

ASDOE continues to implement its original components as explained in the five strands of its Theory of Action (materials, professional development, collaboration with general education, parent support and involvement, and accountability and quality standards).

Materials related to the implementation of the DL program continue to be refined and used on professional development activities. For example, this year, as a result of last year's PDSA, the SSIP core team, together with teachers, refined instructions for the development of lesson plans.

Professional development is the most important component of the SSIP. Every year new elements are included, refined, and implemented for all pilot schools. In FFY 2019 a mentoring/coaching element was implemented and followed up on a bi-weekly basis. Teachers rated the training received at 100% (very good).

The collaboration with general education continues to be a critical component of the SSIP, which is based on the ASDOE strategic plan, its main component is the DL program. In FFY 2019 the Dual Language program and the SSIP core team continue to work together to plan activities, deliver professional development, participate in PDSA activities, use data to measure progress, make adjustments to the implementation of the SSIP.

Parents are increasingly involved in the implementation of the SSIP. In FFY 2019 they were trained to be in-classroom volunteers to assist teachers. Parents participating in professional development activities rated the training at 92% ("very good").

Overall, the evaluation team continues to summarize all data on each year's SSIP report, which is the ultimate measure of accountability. Its information is available to the public and different data summaries are used to help ASDOE teams make decisions for the improvement of performance of students with disabilities in the area of literacy.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.
(Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Stakeholder engagement is an integral part of the SSIP since its inception in Phase I. Stakeholders are our partners and are engaged at the informing, networking, collaborating and transformative level (following the Leading by Convening classifications of engagement).

Our stakeholders consist of school based teams from our five pilot schools (Principals, Special Education Program Directors, Resource Specialists, Special Education Teachers, General Education Teachers, Parents). In addition, other stakeholders include the DL Program staff, the office of Curriculum and Instruction, the Office of Testing and Evaluation, the Special Education Advisory Council, the Office of Integrated Data Services and the SSIP core team.

In September 22nd-24th, 2020, during the Pilot School Training on DL assessment materials, all five pilot schools and their stakeholders (administrators, teachers, parents) were able to review, learn, and receive updates on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including how it was designed and how the SIMR was selected. They also received updates on the Dual Language implementation and its connection to the SSIP. The focus of this meeting was for all of them to become familiar with the pre and post testing of the DL assessment materials. The pilot schools and SSIP core team established a process of collecting testing materials, scoring, logging scores and to determine the timeline of testing based on student performance.

During the September meetings, the SSIP team facilitated a PDSA activity for each school, specifically tied to each school's progress on the implementation of the SSIP. Each school's stakeholders provided input into the design and development of the evaluation and ensured the SSIP team continues to (a) ask the right evaluation questions, (b) collect sufficient data to answer the evaluation questions, (c) analyze the data appropriately, and (d) use the data for secondary transition program improvement. They evaluated progress from what had been implemented, discussed areas of need, gathered suggestions for improvement and decided on improvements for the next year of activities (Plan, Do, Study, Act).

In October 06, 2020, school based teams received training on the IEP. As part of the SSIP plan this school based team training looks at three important areas: Awareness of the SSIP plan, the connection to the DL program and parents' participation in the development of the IEP of their child. Also, IDEA was highlighted as the basis of special education policies and procedures. NCSI was also part of this training through virtual access with Cesar D'Agord on IEP requirements and a focus on classroom accommodations for instruction and assessment. The SSIP core team and special education parent coordinators were on hand to help with questions and in facilitating the training.

On November 18, 2020 the ASDOE SSIP team provided parent training. The focus of this training was on parents of IEP students in the Dual Language program. The parents learned, reviewed and received updates on the SSIP, RDA, and the DL program. The SPED parent coordinators were also on hand to share activities, process and awareness on the parent network. Parents were able to identify support to schools for the implementation of the EBPs, provide recommendations and suggestions on how to proceed in improving reading proficiency for students with disabilities, provide recommendations and suggestions to adjust implementation of the SSIP.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? Choose an item.

If "Yes", describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

The only concern stakeholders expressed were related to the Measles outbreak and then the Covid 19 pandemic. School closures were mandated by the governor, when social gatherings were prohibited from convening on March 20, 2020.

Therefore the SSIP core team changed its implementation procedures, together with school activities, and an effort was made to personally contact parents directly to organize service delivery and instruction observing social distancing (virtual classrooms where applicable, packages to students, including the specifically designed instruction for students with disabilities).

The stakeholders in schools were concerned with the shortage of classroom teachers. Some teachers were off-island before the Measles outbreak and the COVID-19 pandemic and were not able to return to American Samoa due to cancellations of commercial flights into American Samoa, as part of the American Samoan government COVID-19 measures. Together with teachers who were promoted to upper grade levels, there was a teacher shortage situation in this period. The SSIP team, together with the DL program, was required to provide professional development training for new teachers during after school hours.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Not applicable to American Samoa.