

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

American Samoa



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**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

In the past year, American Samoa received TA from the following OSEP funded centers: National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), IDEA Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSY), Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA), IDEA Data Center (IDC) and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR). NCSI hosts monthly webinars for the Pacific Entities, called Pacific Entities Learning Collaborative. On these webinars, we can interact with the other Pacific Entities, share and learn from each other, as well as hear presentations from TA providers from several centers, such as CIFR, IDC, NCII, NCIL, and Progress Center, among others. The NCSI TA facilitator is invited to attend American Samoa's monthly calls with our OSEP Team Lead, and coaches us on OSEP's directives, as a follow up from these monthly calls. American Samoa participates on NCSI's Learning Collaboratives, and attends meetings organized by NCSI, with a focus on the Results Based Accountability Systems (RBAS) collaborative. American Samoa attended the NCSI-organized Pacific Entities Learning Collaborative event, in October of 2022.

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

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

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

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

ASDOE has been significantly impacted by COVID 19 compared to other states. Due to COVID disruptions ASDOE was not able to administer the statewide assessment for grades 3 and 4 ELA and MATH respectively.

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 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 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 American Samoa's procedural safeguards

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 an opportunity for SPED staff to troubleshoot issues before they become problems. Also they are an opportunity for needs assessment at the school level and for delivery of professional development.

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

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

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

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:

6

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 26, 2023, to discuss the updates and progress of the 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 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, 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 2020 APR is found in the following link.

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

The FFY 2021 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Data	100.00%	93.33%	95.83%	81.82%	81.08%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	40

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	6
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
40	49	81.08%	87.00%	81.63%	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:
 $GRADUATION\ RATE = \frac{Total\ Grad}{Total\ Grad + Gr9\ DO + Gr10\ DO + Gr11\ DO + 12Gr\ DO + 12Gr\ RC + RMA}$.

(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)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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.

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	10.81%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	10.81%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.93%	10.81%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	40
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	6
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3	49	10.81%	10.70%	6.12%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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

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

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	90.00%	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.50%	93.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	90.00%	90.50%	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	92.00%	92.50%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

12/21/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 3	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	6	2	53
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	0	0	11
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	4	2	3

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

12/21/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	2	51	3
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	0	37	0
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2	2	3

*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 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	4	6	82.61%	90.00%	66.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	2	2	93.75%	94.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	14	53	90.91%	91.00%	26.42%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2	2	80.56%	90.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	39	51	91.67%	92.00%	76.47%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	3	3	97.44%	97.44%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

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 2021 assessment results are found at this link:

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

Results of assessments can also be viewed at <https://ascews-k12.doe.as/Dashboard/dashboard/3522> for all schools and all students.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to COVID disruptions ASDOE was not able to administer grades 3 and 4 ELA and MATH respectively. The ASDOE data (Section 618 files 175, 178, 185, and 188) that was available was submitted timely to EdFacts. The ASDOE assessment data was not prepopulated because ASDOE worked with PSC and OSEP to determine what grades ASDOE could report for groups A, B, and C. Below are the data ASDOE submitted via section 618 data requirements.

Group A ELA grade 3

ELA assessment for grade 3 was not administered due to COVID 19.

Group B ELA grade 8

Number of Students with IEP's: 55

Number of Students Participating: 36

Percent of Students Participating: 65.45%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target

Progress or Slippage: Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:

Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group C ELA grade HS

Number of Students with IEP's: 54

Number of Students Participating: 17

Percent of Students Participating:31.48%
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not Meet target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group A Math grade 4
Math assessment for grade 4 was not administered due to COVID 19.

Group B Math grade 8
Number of Students with IEP's:55
Number of Students Participating: 36
Percent of Students Participating: 65.45%
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group C Math grade HS
Number of Students with IEP's: 54
Number of Students Participating: 0
Percent of Students Participating: 0
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet Target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

12/21/2022

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			11
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			0

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

12/21/2022

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		37	0
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level		0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level		2	0

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3			11.11%	11.50%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8			23.26%	23.40%		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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	11	0.00%	0.50%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			3.85%	4.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2	37	7.14%	7.50%	5.41%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	0	0.00%	0.50%		N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

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 2021 assessment results are found at this link:

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

Results of assessments can also be viewed at <https://ascews-k12.doe.as/Dashboard/dashboard/3522> for all schools and all students.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to COVID disruptions ASDOE was not able to administer grades 3 and 4 ELA and MATH respectively. The ASDOE data (Section 618 files 175, 178, 185, and 188) that was available was submitted timely to EdFacts. The ASDOE assessment data was not prepopulated because ASDOE worked with PSC and OSEP to determine what grades ASDOE could report for groups A, B, and C. Below are the data ASDOE submitted via section 618 data requirements.

Group A ELA grade 3

ELA assessment for grade 3 was not administered due to COVID 19.

Group B ELA grade 8

Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards: 5

Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment: 36

Percent of Students 13.89%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Met Target

Progress or Slippage: No Slippage

Group C ELA grade HS

Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards: 0

Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment 17

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target

Progress or Slippage: Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:

Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group A Math grade 4

Math assessment for grade 4 was not administered due to COVID 19.

Group B Math grade 8

Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards: 5

Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment: 36

Percent of Students 13.89%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Met Target

Progress or Slippage: No Slippage

Group C Math Grade HS

Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards:0

Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment: 0

Percent of Students: 0

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target

Progress or Slippage: Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:

Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	25.00%	25.00%	25.50%	26.00%	26.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	66.50%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 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.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

12/21/2022

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	4	2	3
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	0	0

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

12/21/2022

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	2	2	3
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	0	0

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	0	4	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	0	2	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	3	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	2	66.67%	66.50%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	0	2	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	0	3	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

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 2021 assessment results are found at this link:

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

Results of assessments can also be viewed at <https://ascews-k12.doe.as/Dashboard/dashboard/3522> for all schools and all students.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to COVID disruptions ASDOE was not able to administer grades 3 and 4 ELA and MATH respectively. The ASDOE data (Section 618 files 175, 178, 185, and 188) that was available was submitted timely to EdFacts. The ASDOE assessment data was not prepopulated because ASDOE worked with PSC and OSEP to determine what grades ASDOE could report for groups A, B, and C. Below are the data ASDOE submitted via section 618 data requirements.

Group A ELA grade 3

Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards:0

Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Academic Achievement Standard: 4
Percent of Students 0
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group B ELA grade 8
Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: 0
Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Academic Achievement Standard: 2
Percent of Students 0
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group C ELA grade HS
Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards: 0
Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Academic Achievement Standard: 3
Percent of Students: 0%
Met Target or Did not Meet Target :Did not meet target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group A Math grade 4
Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards: 1
Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment: 2
Percent of Students: 50%
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Met Target
Progress or Slippage: No Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group B Math grade 8
Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards: 0
Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment: 2
Percent of Students 0%
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group C Math Grade HS
Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards:0
Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment: 3
percent of Students: 0%
Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target
Progress or Slippage: Slippage
Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:
Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.
For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using 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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 3					
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	15.65	15.60	15.55	15.50	15.40
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	19.50	19.25	19.00	18.75	18.50
Math	A <=	Grade 4	9.00	8.50	8.00	7.50	7.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	2.50	2.25	2.00	1.75	1.50
Math	C <=	Grade HS	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 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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

12/21/2022

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	0	540	263
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			11
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	179	34
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	5	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			0

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

12/21/2022

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	0	547	245
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment		37	0
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	73	5
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	5	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level		0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level		2	0

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3			-6.07			N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8		34.07%	15.69	15.65		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0.00%	12.93%	20.02	19.50	12.93	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4			9.15	9.00		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5.41%	14.26%	2.87	2.50	8.85	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS		2.04%	2.03	2.02		N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Please read the additional information provided below. The prepopulated data does not appear to match the data submitted.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Group A ELA Grade 3

A. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level in academic achievement standards: 0

B. Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 34.07%

GAP = 34.07%-0% = 34.07%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet the target

Progress of Slippage: Slippage

Justification for Slippage: Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021. For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group A ELA Grade 8

A. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 2.79%

B. Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 12.93%

GAP = 12.93% - 2.79% = 10.14%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Met the target

Progress of Slippage: No Slippage

Justification for Slippage:

Group A ELA Grade HS

A. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards 0

B. Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 2.04%

GAP = 2.04%-0= 2.04%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target

Progress or Slippage: Slippage

Justification for Slippage: Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021. For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group A Math Grade 4

A. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 0

B. Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 0%

GAP = B-A= 0

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target

Progress of Slippage: slippage

Justification for Slippage: Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021. For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group A Math Grade 8

A. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 2.79%

B. Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 14.28%

GAP = 14.28% - 2.79% = 11.49%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target

Progress of Slippage: slippage

Justification for Slippage: Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021. For SY 21-22 ASDOE partially resumed school. ECE to 4 were in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment. However for grades 5,6,7,8 and high school it was optional for the students to take the statewide assessment.

Group A Math Grade HS

A. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 0%

B. Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards: 2.04%

GAP = 2.04% - 0% = 2.04%

Met Target or Did not Meet Target: Did not meet target

Progress of Slippage: no slippage

Justification for Slippage:

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

4A. Definition of Significant Discrepancy in American Samoa:

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

American Samoa is a single school district. American Samoa examines data on suspension and expulsion rates to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. Significant Discrepancy is when the rate (%) of children with IEPs suspended and expelled exceeds the rate (%) of 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 2021 SPP/APR.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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

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

Targets

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	507
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	436
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	0

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

NO

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	436	507	83.30%	83.50%	86.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2	507	8.35%	8.30%	0.39%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	507	0.40%	0.40%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
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.

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	14	14	0	28
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	14	14	0	28
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class				
b2. Number of children attending separate school				
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	0	0	0	0

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

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	28	28	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	28	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	0	28	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2020	Target >=	94.30%	94.80%	94.80%	94.80%	63.64%
A1	63.64%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%	63.64%
A2	2009	Target >=	74.40%	74.90%	74.90%	74.90%	75.00%

A2	71.40%	Data	83.33%	76.19%	91.67%	75.00%	77.27%
B1	2009	Target >=	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%	76.20%	76.70%
B1	72.70%	Data	100.00%	81.82%	100.00%	100.00%	76.92%
B2	2009	Target >=	58.10%	58.60%	58.60%	58.60%	59.10%
B2	55.10%	Data	83.33%	71.43%	91.67%	75.00%	68.18%
C1	2020	Target >=	75.70%	76.20%	76.20%	76.20%	75.00%
C1	75.00%	Data	100.00%	90.91%	100.00%	100.00%	75.00%
C2	2020	Target >=	54.00%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%	50.00%
C2	50.00%	Data	91.67%	76.19%	95.83%	75.00%	50.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	64.10%	64.60%	65.10%	65.60%	66.10%
Target A2 >=	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%
Target B1 >=	77.20%	77.70%	78.20%	78.70%	79.20%
Target B2 >=	59.60%	60.10%	60.60%	61.10%	61.60%
Target C1 >=	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%
Target C2 >=	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.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

14

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	28.57%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2	14.29%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	4	28.57%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4	28.57%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	6	10	63.64%	64.10%	60.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
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>	8	14	77.27%	75.50%	57.14%	Did not meet target	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	7	50.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	14.29%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1	7.14%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	21.43%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	7.14%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	4	13	76.92%	77.20%	30.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4	14	68.18%	59.60%	28.57%	Did not meet target	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	3	20.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4	26.67%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4	26.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	20.00%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	6.67%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	7	14	75.00%	75.50%	50.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4	15	50.00%	50.50%	26.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	ASDOE has been significantly impacted by COVID 19 compared to other states in FFY 2021. The ASDOE's actions implemented to prevent the spread of COVID 19 more significantly impacted students in the ECE program, kindergarten and grades first through four.
A2	ASDOE has been significantly impacted by COVID 19 compared to other states in FFY 2021. The ASDOE's actions implemented to prevent the spread of COVID 19 more significantly impacted students in the ECE program, kindergarten and grades first through four.
B1	ASDOE has been significantly impacted by COVID 19 compared to other states in FFY 2021. The ASDOE's actions implemented to prevent the spread of COVID 19 more significantly impacted students in the ECE program, kindergarten and grades first through four.
B2	ASDOE has been significantly impacted by COVID 19 compared to other states in FFY 2021. The ASDOE's actions implemented to prevent the spread of COVID 19 more significantly impacted students in the ECE program, kindergarten and grades first through four.
C1	ASDOE has been significantly impacted by COVID 19 compared to other states in FFY 2021. The ASDOE's actions implemented to prevent the spread of COVID 19 more significantly impacted students in the ECE program, kindergarten and grades first through four.
C2	ASDOE has been significantly impacted by COVID 19 compared to other states in FFY 2021. The ASDOE's actions implemented to prevent the spread of COVID 19 more significantly impacted students in the ECE program, kindergarten and grades first through four.

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)

7 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	66.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	88.50%	89.00%	89.50%	89.50%	89.50%
Data	80.32%	90.85%	91.03%	84.35%	73.97%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
261	280	73.97%	89.50%	93.21%	Met target	No Slippage

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

ASDOE-SPED implements a survey that is used to combine data from school-age and pre-school children.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

420

Percentage of respondent parents

66.67%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	93.93%	66.67%

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

There was a reduction in the percent of parents who responded to the parent survey in FFY 2021, which went from a 93.93% in return rate in FFY 2020 to 66.51% in FFY 2021. Although 66.51% is a good return rate, the reduction was due to the difficulty in accessing parents when, due to COVID 19, ASDOE operations were closed. ASDOE expects to return to a higher survey return rate in FFY 2022.

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 making survey distribution and parents responses more difficult.

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.

ASDOE analyzed the data using to student demographics: race/ethnicity and type of school (preschool, elementary and high school).

Using the +/- 3% discrepancy to measure the proportion of responders and comparing it to the target group, ASDOE measured race/ethnicity and school type (early childhood, elementary and high school students) as the key demographic characteristic. In terms of race ethnicity, 97.86% of the respondents and 99.07% of the population were from the same race-ethnicity, that is, almost 100% of the target population and respondents were "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" race/ethnicity, and the difference between respondents and student population were within the accepted discrepancy rate, we do not expect a nonresponse bias from this group.

However, for types of school, there was a slight overrepresentation of parents of students attending elementary schools of 4.84% (greater than the higher limit of +3%) and a slight underrepresentation of parents representing the students attending high schools of -4.82% (greater than the lower limit of -3%). Parents of preschool students indicated a 91.85% agreement with Indicator 8 statement, parents of elementary school students indicated a 92.90% of agreement, and parents of high school students indicated a 94.03% agreement, with a final data of all parents indicating a 93.21%. That is, the nonresponse bias, with parents of elementary school students overrepresented and parents of high school students underrepresented in the group of respondents, although it is a small bias, likely provided an underestimation of the true value of how all parents agree with the indicator 8 statement (it

would be higher than 93.21%).

American Samoa will look at ways to improve the response rate for parents of students attending high school in FFY 2022, achieving a broader cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

Using the +/- 3% discrepancy to measure the proportion of responders and comparing it to the target group, ASDOE measured race/ethnicity and school type (early childhood, elementary and high school students) as the key demographic characteristic. In terms of race ethnicity, 97.86% of the respondents and 99.07% of the population were from the same race-ethnicity, that is, almost 100% of the target population and respondents were “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander” race/ethnicity, and the difference between respondents and student population were within the accepted discrepancy rate (+/- 3% discrepancy), we do not expect a nonresponse bias from this group.

However, for types of school, there was a slight overrepresentation of parents of students attending elementary schools of 4.84% (greater than the higher limit of +3%) and a slight underrepresentation of parents representing the students attending high schools of -4.82% (greater than the lower limit of -3%).

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

NO

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

American Samoa will look at ways to improve the response rate for parents of students attending high school in FFY 2022, such as following up more closely with high schools and the parents of high school students to improve their response rate and achieving a broader cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	Parent Survey (22-23) Form

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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

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 the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	97.08%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
114	109	97.08%	100%	95.61%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

American Samoa Special Education experienced slippage with Indicator 11 due to the negative impacts of COVID 19. Specifically, five students had their evaluation delayed due to schools closing because of COVID 19. This is the reason why there was slippage on B-11.

All 5 students had their initial evaluations completed although late.

Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

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

5

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

The range of days went from 10 to 58 days late.

- Student A was 12 days late
- Student B was 13 days late
- Student C was 10 days late
- Student D was 58 days late
- Student E was 18 days late

The reason for the delay was due to the negative impacts of COVID 19, these five students had their evaluation delayed due to schools closing.

Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

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 Educational Specialists to meet every month with the General Supervision Team that consists of the compliance officer, the transition specialist, parent coordinators, program directors, the assistant director, program coordinator, transportation coordinator and the assessment coordinator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The American Samoa Special Education monitoring team issued in FFY 2020 four findings of noncompliance to the American Samoa Special Education assessment team related to the four students (four individual instances) whose evaluation were completed beyond the sixty day timeline.

To verify that the American Samoa Special Education assessment team can demonstrate that it is correctly implementing this specific regulatory requirement, following the findings of noncompliance, the ASDOE monitoring team requested and reviewed three subsequent student evaluation files.

These files were selected based on a pre-established criteria as described below:

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

1-3 individual instances of non compliance: Two consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)

4-7 individual instances of non compliance: Three consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)

7-15 individual instances of non compliance: Four consecutive files (demonstrating 100% compliance)

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

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

Based on the review of these three subsequent files, which the monitoring team verified they were 100% compliant, and the verification of correction of the four individual instances of noncompliance (see below explanation on the verification of correction of the four individual cases), the Monitoring Team determined the FFY 2020 four findings of noncompliance were corrected.

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

American Samoa Special Education monitoring team asked the American Samoa Special Education assessment team to submit the evaluation reports of the 4 students that were noncompliant in FFY 2020. The American Samoa Special Education monitoring team verified that all four students (100% compliant) had completed evaluation although late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because American Samoa reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	26
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	7

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	19
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	19	19	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 Head Start by collecting data, tracking students transitioning from Part C to Part B, and coordinating the effort to make sure all these children have an IEP by their third birthday. The Early Childhood Coordinator uses the database to keep track of Part C to Part B student data and document all cases of students transitioning from Part C to Part B every year. This data is collected on a monthly basis through monthly reports and the data manager is responsible for this monthly collection. The data manager also analyzes the data and work with the Early Childhood Coordinator to share findings and discuss reports for reliability and compliance of Part C to Part B transitioning. The early childhood coordinator, the data manager, and the program director meet monthly to monitor progress on the implementation of early childhood transition. This is how we ensure no student will reach their third birthday without an IEP. The monitoring team participates on our monthly meetings and they collect transition data once a year for monitoring purposes.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
80	101	100.00%	100%	79.21%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

ASDOE experienced slippage with Indicator 13 due to the negative impacts of COVID 19. Specifically, 21 youth with IEPs aged 16 and above were not able to have their transition plan meetings (IEP meetings were canceled due to COVID19). This is the reason why there was slippage on B-13.

Please note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

FFY 2020 Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	46
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	46
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	17
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)	14
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).	11

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2	46	10.81%	46.50%	4.35%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	19	46	45.95%	80.50%	41.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	44	46	100.00%	80.50%	95.65%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	In FFY 2020, 4 students enrolled in college after graduating, while in FFY 2021, 2 students enrolled in college. These were the only two students whose goals in their transition plans were to go to college.
B	In FFY 2020, 13 students were competitively employed after leaving high school. In FFY 2021, 17 students were competitively employed after leaving high school. In specific terms of competitively employed last year they composed 35% of all exiting student and this year they composed 37% of all exiting students. Therefore the reason for slippage on item B is the reduction of the number of students going to college.

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	2020	2021
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 SPED Staff contacts all students and families through emails and phone calls to get data on the post-school outcomes of students with disabilities within a year after graduating. All leavers (100%) provided information regarding their post school outcomes.

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

With a response rate of 100%, 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. 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.

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

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	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 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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020

Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=					

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii)) 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020

Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=					

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

American Samoa is not required to establish baseline or targets because the number of mediations held 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.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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 2021 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 2021 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 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) 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 all elementary schools.

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

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

American Samoa has changed its strategic plan. The old strategic plan was based on the Dual Language program and the new strategic plan is based on the Striving Readers: Early Literacy Initiative K-3 (Read Well & Language for Learning). This new program has required American Samoa to revise its SSIP. Beyond revising the SSIP strategies the new program includes all elementary schools as opposed to the previous program when five schools participated part of our pilot program.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

The change in the wording of the SiMR was based on the change in ASDOE strategic plan. Specifically impacting the SiMR title was a change from the five pilot schools to including all elementary schools. The measurement, 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), will remain the same.

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

Change of strategy and scaling up from 5 pilot schools involved to all elementary schools involved.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

Stakeholders were involved by participating in a group discussion. Stakeholders were provided a summary of the new SSIP and its revised SiMR. Stakeholders were informed through a powerpoint presentation for group discussion. A facilitator from the SSIP core team was present to assist and provide support for clarifying key questions and statements for group inputs and suggestions. The group was able to share their feedback based on the information shared at the meeting. The stakeholders agreed with the new SSIP and revised SiMR.

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)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The SiMR measurement is the same. The schools and the strategies have changed. We are maintaining the strands of the old theory of action but have changed the strategies related to our outcome and SiMR although is the same measure as the previous SiMR, now it includes all elementary schools.

The revised theory of action can be found on the link below
<https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-REPORTS.html>

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>

FFY 2021 American Samoa Theory of Action direct link: <https://www.doe.as/District/Department/7-Special-Education/1272-REPORTS.html>

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2022	

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>= =					

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

		FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
		18.18%			N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

Due to COVID-19 no third grade assessments were implemented. In FFY 2022 (SY 2022-2023) American Samoa is going to provide the baseline for the revised SSIP. At the end of the SY 2022-2023 when assessment data will be available, American Samoa will be meeting with stakeholders to present the baseline and set new targets.

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

The data is going to be collected from Statewide Assessment (SBA).

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

NO

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)

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 note that American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021. Because of COVID 19 in SY 2021-2022, the American Samoa Department of Education students in grades ECE to 4 in attendance virtually so grades 3 and 4 were not required to take the statewide assessment.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

American Samoa Evaluation Plan FFY 2021-FFY 2025 link below:

https://www.doe.as/files/public_files/Evaluation%20Plan%20FFY%202021_FFY%2020251.pdf

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

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

The team has revised the states evaluation plan given that the reading program has changed.

We are maintaining the old evaluation plan but have changed the strategies related to our outcome and SiMR although is the same measure as the previous SiMR, now it includes all elementary schools. These changes were a statewide decision and the special education division accepted these changes.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

American Samoa has changed its strategic plan. The old strategic plan was based on the Dual Language program and the new strategic plan is based on the Striving Readers: Early Literacy Initiative K-3 (Read Well & Language for Learning). This new program has required American Samoa to revise its SSIP. Beyond revising the SSIP strategies the new program includes all elementary schools as opposed to the previous program when five schools participated part of our pilot program. These changes were a statewide decision and the special education division accepted these changes.

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

Training for teachers (regular, TA's and special education) to use the Read Well and Language for Learning curriculum

Training for teachers (regular, TA's and special education) to use the Read Well resources

Training for teachers (regular and special education) on the pre and post assessment tests for ELSI K-3 9Read Well and Language for Learning program instruction

ELSI staff will train SPED teachers to implement the ELSI K-3 (Read Well and Language for Learning)

ELSI Staff will coach and mentor teachers in the implementation of Read Well and Language for Learning program.

Training for teachers (regular and special education), principals, educational specialists, parents on the revised IEP manual

Training for teachers (regular and special education), principals, educational specialists for using the IEP rubric

Training teachers (regular and special education), principals, educational specialists for classroom accommodations for instruction and for assessment of students with disabilities in the Read Well and Language for Learning program

Program Directors, Educational Specialists will coach and mentor teachers in the writing of the IEPs.

Training for parents for awareness regarding the SSIP and the ELSI K-3 (Read Well and Language for Learning)

Program Parents are also invited to attend other professional development activities regarding ELSI K-3 Program and IEP development (see above)

General and special education staff will participate together, on all professional development activities.

Special Education staff will collaborate with General Education to provide ongoing technical support on professional development for IEP manual, IEP rubric, and student accommodation.

Special education will develop communication strategy among all elementary schools, SSIP Core Team, ELSI K-3 (Read Well and Language for Learning) Program staff, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, and special education staff (Professional Learning Community around the ELSI Program)

Gather commitment between ELSI K-3 (Read Well and Language for Learning program, all elementary schools, division of curriculum and instruction, and special education division to participate on SSIP activities (Letter of Commitment).

SSIP Core Team will manage the implementation of the SSIP activities.

ELSI Program will evaluate the effectiveness of teaching practices as well as progress of student achievement against established standards

SSIP Core Team and ELSI Program will analyze the results of the evaluation and will draft an evaluation report.

The SSIP Core Team will gather stakeholders to share the evaluation results and gather their feedback for adjustments to the SSIP implementation as appropriate.

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.

FFY 2021 was the first year of the revised strategic plan. No short-term or intermediate outcomes were achieved during this reporting period.

Furthermore, during the reporting year ASDOE closed all schools due to COVID 19. As noted before, American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

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

NO

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

Professional development:

The (ELSI K-3) office will implement training for teachers (regular and special education) to use the Read Well and Language for Learning curriculum, its lesson planning, the administration of its pre and post-assessment tests. ASDOE Early Literacy Skills Initiative K-3 program has trained all special education teachers in grades K-5 to 2 in all elementary schools.

IEP Goals & Objectives:

The SSIP Core team and consultants will conduct IEP training for teachers (regular and special education), principals, educational specialists, parents, and the school-based team on the revised IEP manual, and the IEP rubric.

Parent Involvement:

Training for parents will be held for all elementary schools on campus throughout the school year. Parents will also part of the bigger stakeholders' meetings sharing their student progress and testimonies on milestones they have seen since the implementation of the program.

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 will 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 will evaluate the implementation of activities through evaluation surveys and shares results with stakeholders for their feedback so upcoming activities can be adjusted if applicable.

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

Read Well and Language for Learning include the following components:

Scaffolding

Phonological and Phonemic Awareness

Alphabetic Principle and Phonics
Fluency
Vocabulary
Comprehension

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Read Well and Language for Learning include the following components explained in more detail:

Scaffolding:

Scaffolding is one of the key features of the program in which teachers begin by presenting models and gradually decreasing their support by providing guided practice before students are asked to complete the skill or strategy independently.

Phonological and phonemic awareness

Read Well is structured around a specific sound sequence that: (1) introduces high-utility sounds before low-utility sounds and (2) separates easily confused sounds. Students in Read Well K and Read Well 1 usually learn one new sound from the sound sequence in each unit. Most phonemic awareness activities have accompanying cards and posters that guide students to make a connection between the sounds they hear and the letter or letters that make that sound. In the levels for second and third grades, when students are adept at recognizing high utility sounds, the focus switches to lower-utility sounds. Read Well uses explicit instruction and multiple approaches to teach students to recognize, think about, and work with the new sounds. Phonemic awareness instruction easily flows into phonics instruction.

Alphabetic Principle and Phonics

An important aspect of phonics instruction is encoding, or spelling. The positive role that encoding and spelling instruction play in early reading development is often underappreciated. For this reason, focused and explicit spelling instruction has not been adequately leveraged in most reading curricula. Phonics instruction in Read Well includes letter-sound identification, blending sounds, and recognition of high-utility and irregular words. Students practice phonics skills with words pulled from the text that correspond to the sounds being taught in the Word Work instruction. Then the students read the text and encounter words with the sounds they have just learned. Specifically in Read Well 3, students study types of syllables to facilitate their reading of multisyllabic words.

Fluency

Read Well moves students from decoding sounds in a word to reading multisyllabic words with automaticity. This is accomplished through instruction in recognizing word parts and chunking those parts into words. The first step in this process is for students to use decoding skills to flex vowel sounds. Then, students build a bank of sight syllables that helps them read unfamiliar words by chunking words into syllables rather than reading each sound individually. Students also study the six most common types of syllables in the English language. Learning these syllable types and the rules that govern them greatly improves automaticity with unfamiliar words.

Vocabulary

As students progress through the program from Read Well K to Read Well 3, the vocabulary words increase in complexity. Instruction in Read Well K and Read Well 1 builds students' lexicon of words and sight words, which include high-utility and irregular words. Read Well 2 continues to add to students' lexicon while also encouraging them to internalize the words they already know. Students in Read Well 3 continue adding to their lexicon and learn vocabulary strategies for figuring out word meaning during independent reading.

Comprehension

Read Well includes comprehension objectives that tap the multiple levels of thinking described in Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) and other thinking skills models. Students are taught to monitor their own comprehension and be aware of when their understanding begins to wane. Fix-up strategies are effective ways students learn to remedy their comprehension breakdowns. For example, students learn when they should reread and/or read more slowly. Students are also given ample opportunities to reread text and practice their new reading skills before moving on to the next unit.

Comprehension and Skill Work activities in Read Well train students to

- preview and make predictions;
- make connections and comparisons;
- enhance comprehension by identifying, describing, asking questions, visualizing, illustrating, classifying, note-taking, summarizing, responding, and evaluating;
- identify and analyze story elements, text features, text structure, and vocabulary;
- practice study and test-taking skills; and • respond orally and in the form of written work utilizing new vocabulary in complete sentences.

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.

Phonological and phonemic awareness

The Read Well curriculum

- includes chants, songs, and poems that introduce new sounds, and reinforce sound familiarity, making it rich in oral language;
- helps students hear and isolate beginning, middle, and ending sounds;
- provides segmentation and sound counting instruction and practice (orally, through finger counting, and/or by following visual cues on blending cards); and
- provides sound blending instruction and practice (orally, through hand movements, by using manipulatives, and/or by following visual cues on blending cards).

Alphabetic Principle and Phonics

Throughout the entire Read Well program, students learn to decode unfamiliar words by processing all the letter sounds and sight syllables they have learned. Stahl, Osborn, and Lehr (1990) note that skillful readers process words this way "whether they are reading isolated words or meaningful, connected text" (p. 18). Encoding is a pivotal part of Read Well, with the focus set around the progression of systematic and explicit instruction within the continuum of kindergarten to third grade. Encoding is incorporated into Read Well K Whole Class and Small Group. Read Well 1 and Read Well 2 have stand-alone Spelling and Writing Dictation components, and Read Well 3 has teacher-directed instruction with dictation of words students will read in the current passage.

Fluency

Fluency lessons occur at least once per unit. These lessons include practice that allows students to develop accuracy and prosody in reading text. Read

Well students build fluency gradually through repeated readings. A variety of reading activities give the students enjoyable practice in oral reading. These include Duet Stories, Solo Stories, Partner Reading, and Turn Reading. Combining these oral reading skills within the context of vocabulary and comprehension instruction is the next step in a move to reading with fluency

Vocabulary words in Read Well are

- read by the teacher in the teacher-read text;
- spoken by the students as teacher-led questions prompt students to use the words orally and in class discussion; • used repeatedly throughout the unit and often repeated in subsequent units;
- read by the students in decoding practice, activities prior to reading the story, and then in the Storybooks;
- written and practiced in a variety of meaningful activities during independent time; and
- revisited within and across units.

Comprehension

Skilled readers differ from less skilled readers in their use of background knowledge to comprehend text and to draw valid inferences about what they have read (Dickson, Simmons, & Kame'enui, 1998). Van den Broek, Kendeou, Lousberg, and Visser (2011) also note that "reading comprehension improves when readers are explicitly taught various strategies such as activating prior knowledge, self-monitoring, summarizing, identifying text structures, and questioning" (p. 261). Current findings indicate that comprehension questions asked during reading are more effective than when asked at the end of reading (van den Broek, et al., 2011). Further, "effective interventions are those that influence readers' actual processes during comprehension, particularly at points where children's comprehension process tends to break down" (van den Broek, et al., 2011, p. 265). The National Reading Panel (2000) concluded that "comprehension instruction can effectively motivate and teach readers to learn and to use comprehension strategies that benefit the reader. These comprehension strategies yield increases in measures of near transfer such as recall, question answering and generation, and summarization of texts" (National Reading Panel, 2000, p. 6)

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

ASDOE will use 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 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.

This data was not collected in FFY 2021 due to ASDOE closing all schools due to COVID 19. As noted before, American Samoa experienced significant impact from COVID 19 during the reporting period of FFY 2021.

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.

Acadience Assessment (formerly known as DIBELS-Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) which will be rolled out and implemented in FFY 2022. It will be collected three times a year as an interim measurement of the SiMR (SBA).

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

ASDOE will roll out training FFY 2022 and refreshers for ELSI K-3 (Read Well and Language for Learning).

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

YES

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

FFY 2021 is the first year of the revised SSIP.

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 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.

Stakeholders meeting was held January 26, 2023. Changes to the SSIP FFY 21. (JAN. 29)

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

Stakeholders will be invited to virtual and face to face meetings. In these meetings ASDOE SPED staff will present progress on implementation of the SSIP and will engage stakeholders in a Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) activity to gather their feedback and prioritize areas for improvement in the implementation of the SSIP.

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

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

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 Junella Boat

Title:

State Directoe

Email:

herbert.boat@doe.as

Phone:

6847824123

Submitted on:

02/01/23 8:40:38 PM