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# 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**

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Republic of Palau (ROP) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2021 - FFY 2025 and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2021. A description of ROP’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR and how ROP will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of ROP’s FFY 2021 APR.

With input from stakeholders, in FFY 2020, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2025. This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. As per OSEP’s instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, ROP reports FFY 2021 data to determine whether ROP met its targets, and if not, explained slippage where applicable baseline, and respond to any issue identified for the Indicator in the June 25, 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter and ROP’s FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

With input from stakeholders, this FFY 2021 SPP/APR includes re-establishing baseline and targets through FFY 2025 for Indicator 17: SSIP.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

1

**General Supervision System:**

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

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary education system that includes 18 elementary schools for grades 1-8 and one public high school for grades 9-12. The Special Education Program is a program under the direct supervision of the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). The delivery of special education and related services is provided within the schools under the supervision of the school principals. As a result of the Ministry of Education's restructuring, the Minister of Education now serves as the direct supervisor of the school principals.

The Head Start Program, administered through the Palau Community Action Agency, serves as the primary educational setting for preschoolers with disabilities. Consistent with Head Start Program Performance Standards on Services to Children with Disabilities, Section 1308.4, the ROP-MOE has general supervision oversight, including monitoring, of the special education and related services provided for preschoolers with disabilities within the Head Start Program.

Demonstration of accountability measures under IDEA is seen through a system of general supervision. ROP MOE has in place policies and procedures, consistent with the IDEA Part B requirements for providing special education and related services for children with disabilities. ROP MOE also has in place the IDEA Notice of Procedural Safeguards provided to parents of children with disabilities. Another component of ROP’s system of general supervision is the comprehensive monitoring of the implementation of IDEA, with a focus on improving results for children and youth with disabilities. ROP MOE developed the Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) that includes on-site and off-site monitoring activities, with written guidance for the identification and correction of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. ROP MOE has designated the Special Education Program to facilitate the implementation of the CIFMS through the Minister of Education in accordance with the new changes to MOE infrastructure. For the Head Start Program, the CIFMS is facilitated through the BCI Director to the Head Start Program Director.

The ROP-MOE Special Education Program is administered by the Special Education Coordinator. The Special Education Coordinator supervises special education personnel responsible for supporting the development and delivery of special education and related services in the schools and other appropriate educational settings.

**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.**

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary system that provides timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to schools. The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI) is responsible for developing appropriate curricula with instructional materials for all public schools and providing training and support to school personnel for ensuring the educational programs result in successful students in Palauan society and the world. The BCI includes content, assessment, and training specialists who provide the technical assistance, training, and support to school personnel, including special education teachers. The Special Education Program Coordinator and Specialists collaborate with the BCI Chiefs and Specialists for improving instructional programs and services for all students, including students with disabilities. The Special Education Program provides technical assistance and support to the schools in collaboration with the content, assessment, and training specialists. The Special Education Core Team comprised of the Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialist (previously known as Consulting Resource Teachers - CRTs), Data Manager and related service providers, hold meetings as needed to discuss the status of all improvement activities and what can be done to support indicator cluster teams carry out specific SPP indicator activities, which include collaborating with the BCI content, assessment, and training specialists to implement training activities with parents, principals, teachers, and related service providers at different times of the year. All technical assistance and support to the schools are coordinated as a system.

The Head Start Program, administered through the Palau Community Action Agency, serves as the primary educational setting for preschoolers with disabilities. ROP MOE has general supervision oversight, including monitoring, of the special education and related services provided for preschoolers with disabilities within the Head Start Program. ROP MOE Special Education Program collaborates with the Head Start Program to provide technical assistance and support to the Head Start Center teachers, staff, and parents.

The Special Education Program also provides parent workshops focused on parent rights, state complaints, parent roles and responsibilities in the special education process, and other topical areas. The parent workshops are conducted in collaboration with the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), ROP’s organization for parents of children with disabilities, and school administrators to identify the workshop topical focus and scheduling. The Special Education Program collaborates with other ROP Ministries, programs, and organizations, such as the Ministry of Health and Human Services, Behavioral and Public Health Services, Ministry of Justice, the Work Force Innovation Opportunity Act out of the Executive Office, and PPE, to provide technical assistance and support to the schools. In addition, the Special Education Program accesses US National resources, such as OSEP-funded projects, to support ROP’s efforts to improve educational results for students with disabilities. These resources, similar to resources accessed by the BCI content, assessment, and training specialists, are incorporated into and coordinated with the MOE BCI and school-level training, technical assistance, and support activities.

**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.**

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary system that ensures service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities. MOE’s professional development system includes professional standards for all teachers and implementation of specific MOE and school-level professional development training plans. Individual School Improvement Plans (SIP) target improving student academic skills, which prioritize the professional development training needs at the school-level.

The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI) facilitates the training and support to school personnel for ensuring the educational programs result in successful students in Palauan society and the world. The BCI includes content, assessment, and training specialists who provide the technical assistance, training, and support to school personnel, including special education teachers. The Special Education Coordinator and Specialists collaborate with the BCI Chiefs and Specialists for improving instructional programs and services for all students, including students with disabilities. Specific special education training activities for principals, teachers, related service providers, and parents are coordinated with the MOE and school-level professional development training plans. MOE sponsors an annual ROP Educational Convention in the summer that offers workshops and presentations on prioritized topical areas for all teachers and administrators.

In collaboration with the BCI Chiefs and Specialists, the Special Education Coordinator and Core Team facilitate the implementation of the prioritized training needs, including parent training. In addition, the Special Education Coordinator accesses various local, regional, and national resources to support improved related service provisions for children with disabilities. For several years, ROP Special Education Program has had a contract with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS). This year's consultants and trainers through Guam CEDDERS worked with the Special Education Core Team on identified needs or on-going initiatives for the provision of special education to students with disabilities, families, stakeholders and other partner agencies or programs. Guam CEDDERS has also been instrumental as a liaison on occasions for the Special Education Program with US mainland and Pacific entities on related work issues.

With OSEP’s Results-Driven Accountability focus, the BCI Director has endorsed ROP’s commitment to the development and implementation of ROP’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as a MOE Initiative. The BCI Director appoints key MOE administrators and staff to serve on the MOE SSIP Team. ROP’s SSIP development and implementation is viewed as an overall system improvement process that serves as one of the key MOE technical assistance and professional development efforts to impact the teaching and learning dynamic for improving the educational results for ALL students.

**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).**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

29

**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.**

Special Ed. Advisory Council (SEAC) met in January 2023 to review ROP’s FFY2021 APR performance data and trend data for each Indicator, to provide input on target setting for FFY2021-2025 SSP/APR. They will prioritize effort on improving student results on the statewide assessment. They will prepare and forward a written communication to the Ministry of Education leadership with recommendation to reassess how students with disabilities are accommodated during statewide assessment (IOWA) with consideration to increase number of days for the testing window.

**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.**

During the week of November 29-December 03, 2022, the Ministry of Education (MOE) joined the Ministry of Health and Human Services (MHHS), Palau Parent Empowered (PPE) and Omekesang organizations to celebrate the International Day of Persons with Disabilities. PPE and Omekesang are organizations that represent parents of children with disabilities and individuals with disabilities. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Projected funded by OSEP. Omekesang is an advocacy group of individuals with disabilities. Special ed. program coordinator and staff participated in various activities planned throughout the week. The special ed. program coordinator participated in a radio talk show with Omekesang president and a representative from Palau National Olympic Committee (PNOC) to increase awareness on services and opportunities available for children and youth with disabilities. The special ed. program coordinator and staff also participated in other activities including a parade and a roadside campaign. Other special education staff attended the disability stakeholders symposium with MOE director of curriculum and instruction as one of the panelist.

On January 18-20, 2023, Special Education Program, MOE with Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), and Family Health Unit, MHHS sponsored a Parent Training on Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). MOE chiefs and content specialists, public and private school administrators, special ed. specialists (formerly known as consulting resource teachers/CRTs), special ed. related service providers, special ed. teachers servicing privates schools, MHHS health service providers, and Head Start Program service managers, center coordinators, and family service workers were invited and participated in training activities with parents. The last day of the training was allotted for parents of children with autism who wished to meet with the trainer individually. Thirteen (13) parents participated in this individual consultation with the trainer.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

Special Ed. Advisory Council (SEAC) met in January 2023 to review ROP’s FFY2021 APR performance data and trend data for each Indicator, to provide input on target setting for FFY2021-2025 SSP/APR. They will prioritize effort on improving student results on the statewide assessment. They will prepare and forward a written communication to the Ministry of Education leadership with recommendation to reassess how students with disabilities are accommodated during statewide assessment (IOWA) with consideration to increase number of days for the testing window.

**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.**

The ROP SPP/APR will be provided to SEAC members. In addition, ROP will post its SPP/APR annually within 120 days following ROP's submission of its SPP/APR, including any revisions if ROP has revised its SPP. ROP posts its complete SPP and all APRs on the following ROP MOE website: http://173.230.128.80/?p=Special%20Education%20Program.

**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.**

Republic of Palau (ROP) is a unitary system and does not have LEAs. As required, ROP reports annually to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the ‘measurable and rigorous targets’ found in its SPP through posting its APR. ROP will post its SPP/APR annually within 120 days following ROP's submission of its SPP/APR, including any revisions if ROP has revised its SPP. ROP posts its complete SPP and all APRs on the following ROP MOE website: http://173.230.128.80/?p=Special%20Education%20Program.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State'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**

(1) Technical assistance sources ROP received assistance;

As advised by the Department, ROP utilized the OSEP-funded technical assistance centers for support to improve student results. ROP continues to receive technical assistance from NCSI through monthly Pacific Entities TA calls focusing on state systemic improvement plan and ROP specific TA support in preparation for OSEP monitoring since ROP was assigned to Cohort 3. ROP also received technical assistance from NCEO through a virtual training for SSIP target school administrators, primary grade teachers (gen. ed.), special ed. teachers, education specialists, and the chief of teacher training on intensive intervention strategies and access to teacher resources online. IDC is currently providing technical assistance through a virtual training for a special ed. staff who will take on the responsibility of a data manager on Part B 618 data requirements and submission. PROGRESS Center has been providing technical assistance through training on required IEP components and roles and responsibilities of IEP team members for teachers (gen ed. & sp. ed.), school administrators, school counselors, special ed. related service providers and education specialists.

(2) Actions ROP took as a result of the technical assistance:

The availability of OSEP-funded technical assistance centers have increased ROP's personnel development capacity to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Virtual and on-site training and technical assistance from the various resources have been implemented throughout the year.

To address the long standing noncompliance/grant specific condition related to ROP's Special Education Teacher Certification policy and implementation, MOE leadership, in partnership with the University of Guam (UOG), is implementing a hybrid UOG bachelor's degree program in elementary education with a specialization in special education. This bachelor's degree program is anticipated to be completed in 2024 to meet the shortage of qualified special education teachers. MOE leadership intends to continue its relationship with Palau Community College, UOG, and other 4-year institutions of higher education to design and deliver degree programs to address their personnel development needs.

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - Required Actions

The Republic of Palau's (ROP) IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In ROP's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised ROP of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required ROP to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed ROP 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. ROP must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which ROP received assistance; and (2) the actions ROP took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 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** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 70.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 40.00% |  | 70.10% | 70.10% | 30.00% |
| Data | 33.33% | 70.00% | 16.67% | x[[1]](#footnote-2) | x1 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 35.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 70.10% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**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) | 3 |
| 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) | x[[2]](#footnote-3) |
| 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) | 0 |

**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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 4 | x[[3]](#footnote-4) | 35.00% | 75.00% | Met 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.**

There are two options for students with disabilities to graduate: Regular high school diploma and an IEP diploma/certificate. Regular high school diploma is considered a ‘regular’ diploma for reporting performance for Indicator 1. Effective August 2010, a regular diploma is defined as completion of 27 credits and required high school courses and electives, consistent with the credit and course requirements for all high school students. An IEP diploma/certificate is a diploma/certificate awarded to students who successfully earned 27 credits and completed the requirements of their IEP. The reference to earning 27 credits for an IEP diploma/certificate is related to instructional time completed, i.e. one credit is earned for one class period per semester.

**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[[4]](#footnote-5)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | x[[5]](#footnote-6) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 7.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% | x4 |
| Data | 3.33% | 7.41% | 18.18% | 22.22% | x4 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 25.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**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) | 3 |
| 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) | x[[6]](#footnote-7) |
| 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) | 0 |

**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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 4 | x[[7]](#footnote-8) | 30.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

MOE drop-out procedures, such as attendance and withdrawal requirements, are the same for students without disabilities and students with disabilities. MOE drop-out definition is consistent with the IDEA 618 drop-out definition.

**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 4 | 2020 | 75.00% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 100.00% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 93.33% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 75.00% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 100.00% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 93.33% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 80.00% | 80.00%  | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 80.00% | 80.00% | 85.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 80.00% | 80.00% | 85.00% | 90.00% | 94.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 80.00% | 80.00% | 85.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 80.00% | 80.00% | 85.00% | 90.00% | 94.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2020-FFY 2025 SPP development, the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinators, Specialists, and School Administrators serving as ROP’s SSIP Core Team with regular updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors and Chiefs. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | x[[8]](#footnote-9) | 8 | x6 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | x6 | 5 | 14 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 0 | 0 | x6 |

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 4 | 8 | x6 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4 | 5 | 14 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 0 | 0 | x6 |

\*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 4 | x[[9]](#footnote-10) | x9 | 75.00% | 80.00% | x9 | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 5 | 8 | 100.00% | 80.00% | 62.50% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x9 | x9 | 93.33% | 80.00% | x9 | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 80.00% by 17.50% with a FFY 2021 performance of 62.50% (5/8) and reported slippage by 37.50% from FFY 2020 performance of 100.00% (5/5). By numbers, this slippage represented a difference of three students from five out of five or 100% in FFY2020 to five out of eight in FFY 2021. In FFY 2021, the number of 8th graders who participated remained the same at five, while the total number of 8th graders with an IEP increased to eight enrolled during the testing window.

The reasons for the slippage were students with IEPs in the tested grade did not take the IOWA because they were absent or for “other reasons.” One student was absent and two students did not complete the Reading test for “other reasons” in one elementary school. Possible reasons or considerations for nonparticipation were the short testing window period and no makeup days for absences, which were part of the IOWA administration procedures for all students.

Special Education Program personnel met with the Division of School Testing and Data Collection (DSTDC) specialists responsible for the compilation of the IOWA data to review the IOWA administration procedures and “other reasons” noted for the two students with IEPs who did not complete the IOWA for Reading. The DSTDC specialist confirmed that the one student did not take other administered IOWA content. Special Education personnel also communicated with personnel from the one school, including the principal and special education teachers, regarding the nonparticipation of the two students with IEPs in the reading content of IOWA. The discussions led to the understanding that the “other reasons” noted was primarily due to the testing window to which extended time is not allowed.

Immediate actions to address the issue include putting more emphasis on the current practice which includes reviewing the testing window to allow extended time, make up, and including completion of the “IOWA Transit Form” to document nonparticipation and the reasons. This will be discussed further during the Ministry of Education Quarterly Forum in March 2023 in preparation for the Spring 2023 IOWA to ensure participation in IOWA are properly documented for the reporting of the Part B 618 data (Assessment), APR and other related reports. In addition, the Special Education Program will conduct an on-site monitoring during administration of the Spring 2023 IOWA in the one school where “other reasons” were noted for nonparticipation in the Spring 2022 IOWA. The on-site monitoring will assess the effectiveness of school-level procedures, including the use of the “IOWA Transit Form” for administering the IOWA in all content areas for students with IEPs.

**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 | 4 | 4 | 75.00% | 80.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 5 | 8 | 100.00% | 80.00% | 62.50% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x9 | x9 | 93.33% | 80.00% | x9 | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 80.00% by 17.50% with a FFY 2021 performance of 62.50% (5/8) and reported slippage by 37.50% from FFY 2020 performance of 100.00% (5/5). By numbers, this slippage represented a difference of three students from five out of five or 100% in FFY2020 to five out of eight in FFY 2021. In FFY 2021, the number of 8th graders who participated remained the same at five, while the total number of 8th graders with an IEP increased to eight enrolled during the testing window.

The reasons for the slippage were students with IEPs in the tested grade did not take the IOWA because they were absent or for “other reasons.” One student was absent and two students did not complete the Math test for “other reasons” in one elementary school. Possible reasons or considerations for nonparticipation were the short testing window period and no makeup days for absences, which were part of the IOWA administration procedures for all students.

Special Education Program personnel met with the Division of School Testing and Data Collection (DSTDC) specialists responsible for the compilation of the IOWA data to review the IOWA administration procedures and “other reasons” noted for the two students with IEPs who did not complete the IOWA for Math. The DSTDC specialist confirmed that the one student did not take other administered IOWA content. Special Education personnel also communicated with personnel from the one school, including the principal and special education teachers, regarding the nonparticipation of the two students with IEPs in the Math content of IOWA. The discussions led to the understanding that the “other reasons” noted was primarily due to the testing window to which extended time is not allowed.

Immediate actions to address the issue include putting more emphasis on the current practice which includes reviewing the testing window to allow extended time, make up, and including completion of the “IOWA Transit Form” to document nonparticipation and the reasons. This will be discussed further during the Ministry of Education Quarterly Forum in March 2023 in preparation for the Spring 2023 IOWA to ensure participation in IOWA are properly documented for the reporting of the Part B 618 data (Assessment), APR and other related reports. In addition, the Special Education Program will conduct an on-site monitoring during administration of the Spring 2023 IOWA in the one school where “other reasons” were noted for nonparticipation in the Spring 2022 IOWA. The on-site monitoring will assess the effectiveness of school-level procedures, including the use of the “IOWA Transit Form” for administering the IOWA in all content areas for students with IEPs.

**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.**

As instructed, ROP is required to provide the URL (electronic link) to the location where ROP publicly reports on assessments for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled students, pursuant to 34 CFR 300.160. ROP reports that MOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. ROP provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR, which is posted on the MOE website under Special Education Performance Reports: http://173.230.128.80/?p=Special%20Education%20Program.

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

## 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 4 | 2020 | x[[10]](#footnote-11) |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | x10 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | x10 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | x10 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | x10 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | x10 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 10.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 30.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 25.00% | 25.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 40.00% | 45.00% | 50.00% | 55.00% | 60.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2020-FFY 2025 SPP development, the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinators, Specialists, and School Administrators serving as ROP’s SSIP Core Team with regular updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors and Chiefs. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading 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 | x[[11]](#footnote-12) | 5 | 14 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | x8 | x8 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | x8 | x8 |

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 4 | 5 | 14 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | x8 | x8 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x8 | x8 | 4 |

**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 4 | x[[12]](#footnote-13) | x9 | x9 | 0.00% | x9 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x9 | 5 | x9 | 0.00% | x9 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x9 | 14 | x9 | 10.00% | x9 | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 10% with a FFY 2021 performance of x% (x/14)12 and reported slippage by 7.69% from FFY 2020 performance of 7.69% (x/13)12. In FFY 2021, the number of high school students with IEPs who received valid scores but did not perform at the proficient level is x12 while the total number of high school students with IEPs increased to fourteen enrolled during the testing window.

Possible reasons or considerations for the slippage includes high school offering online classes to students with IEPs from the outer islands and teacher shortage in all the public schools due to the immediate enforcement of the Ministry’s new hiring policy for new teachers. The availability of online classes was a response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In January 2022, the surge of COVID-19 cases required all schools to transition from face-to-face to online learning until mid-February 2022. This shift in learning mode might have contributed to the slippage in performance.

To improve student achievement, beginning school year 2022-2023, the Ministry adopted a year-round school year calendar with 185 days per year instead of the traditional 180 days or a nine-month school calendar. In addition, the Ministry’s efforts continue to prioritize teacher training in reading and math evidenced-based practices, Instructional Coaching, Accelerated Reading, Be Able Reading Program and Response to Instruction. The Special Education Program also supports schools with on-going technical assistance to increase knowledge on disabilities and intervention strategies.

**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 | x9 | 4 | x9 | 30.00% | x9 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x9 | 5 | x9 | 25.00% | x9 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x9 | 14 | x9 | 40.00% | x9 | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 30% by x% with a FFY 2021 performance of x% (x/4) and reported slippage by x% from FFY 2020 performance of x% (x/x).12 In FFY 2021, the number of 4th grade students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards in math assessment is x, while the total number of 4th grade students with IEPs increased to four enrolled during the testing window.

Possible reasons or considerations for the slippage includes the shift to online learning in January 2022 for a month and teacher shortage in all the public schools due to the immediate enforcement of the Ministry’s new hiring policy for new teachers. The availability of online classes was a response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In January 2022, the surge of COVID-19 cases required all schools to transition from face-to-face to online learning until mid-February 2022. This shift in learning mode might have contributed to the slippage in performance.

To improve student achievement, beginning school year 2022-2023, the Ministry adopted a year-round school year calendar with 185 days per year instead of the traditional 180 days or a nine-month school calendar. In addition, the Ministry’s efforts continue to prioritize teacher training in reading and math evidenced-based practices, Instructional Coaching, Accelerated Reading, Be Able Reading Program, Singapore Math, and Response to Instruction. The Special Education Program also supports schools with on-going technical assistance to increase knowledge on disabilities and intervention strategies.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 25% by x% with a FFY 2021 performance of x% (x/5) and reported slippage by x% from FFY 2020 performance of x% (x/4).12 In FFY 2021, the number of 8th grade students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards in math assessment is x, while the total number of 8th grade students with IEPs increased to five enrolled during the testing window.

Possible reasons or considerations for the slippage includes the shift to online learning in January 2022 for a month and teacher shortage in all the public schools due to the immediate enforcement of the Ministry’s new hiring policy for new teachers. The availability of online classes was a response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In January 2022, the surge of COVID-19 cases required all schools to transition from face-to-face to online learning until mid-February 2022. This shift in learning mode might have contributed to the slippage in performance.

To improve student achievement, beginning school year 2022-2023, the Ministry adopted a year-round school year calendar with 185 days per year instead of the traditional 180 days or a nine-month school calendar. In addition, the Ministry’s efforts continue to prioritize teacher training in reading and math evidenced-based practices, Instructional Coaching, Accelerated Reading, Be Able Reading Program, Singapore Math, and Response to Instruction. The Special Education Program also supports schools with on-going technical assistance to increase knowledge on disabilities and intervention strategies.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 40% by 11.43% with a FFY 2021 performance of 28.57% (4/14) and reported slippage by 17.58% from FFY 2020 performance of 46.15% (6/13). By numbers, this slippage represented a difference of two students from six out of thirteen or 46.15% in FFY2020 to four out of fourteen in FFY 2021. In FFY 2021, the number of high school students with IEPs who scored at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards in math assessment is four, while the total number of high school students with IEPs increased to fourteen enrolled during the testing window.

Possible reasons or considerations for the slippage includes high school offering online classes to students with IEPs from the outer islands and teacher shortage in all the public schools due to the immediate enforcement of the Ministry’s new hiring policy for new teachers. The availability of online classes was a response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In January 2022, the surge of COVID-19 cases required all schools to transition from face-to-face to online learning until mid-February 2022. This shift in learning mode might have contributed to the slippage in performance.

To improve student achievement, beginning school year 2022-2023, the Ministry adopted a year-round school year calendar with 185 days per year instead of the traditional 180 days or a nine-month school calendar. In addition, the Ministry’s efforts continue to prioritize teacher training in reading and math evidenced-based practices, Instructional Coaching, Accelerated Reading, Be Able Reading Program and Response to Instruction. The Special Education Program also supports schools with on-going technical assistance to increase knowledge on disabilities and intervention strategies.

**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.**

As instructed, ROP is required to provide the URL (electronic link) to the location where ROP publicly reports on assessments for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled students, pursuant to 34 CFR 300.160. ROP reports that MOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. ROP provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR, which is posted on the MOE website under Special Education Performance Reports: http://173.230.128.80/?p=Special%20Education%20Program.

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

## 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 4 | 2020 | x[[13]](#footnote-14) |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | x10 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | x10 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | x10 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | x10 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | x10 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2020-FFY 2025 SPP development, the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinators, Specialists, and School Administrators serving as ROP’s SSIP Core Team with regular updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors and Chiefs. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading 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 | x[[14]](#footnote-15) | x11 | x11 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | x11 | x11 | x11 |

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | x11 | x11 | x11 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | x11 | x11 | x11 |

**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 4 | x[[15]](#footnote-16) | x12 | x12 | 0.00% | x12 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x12 | x12 | x12 | 0.00% | x12 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x12 | x12 | x12 | 0.00% | x12 | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 | x12 | x12 | x12 | 0.00% | x12 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x12 | x12 | x12 | 0.00% | x12 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x12 | x12 | x12 | 0.00% | x12 | Met target | No Slippage |

**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.**

As instructed, ROP is required to provide the URL (electronic link) to the location where ROP publicly reports on assessments for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled students, pursuant to 34 CFR 300.160. ROP reports that MOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. ROP provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR, which is posted on the MOE website under Special Education Performance Reports: http://173.230.128.80/?p=Special%20Education%20Program.

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

## 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 4 | 2020 | 33.49 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 48.88 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 49.23 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 0.00 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 19.84 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 9.01 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 33.10 | 30.00  | 28.00 | 26.00 | 20.00 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 45.00 | 40.00 | 35.00 | 30.00 | 25.00 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 45.00 | 40.00 | 35.00 | 30.00 | 25.00 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 0.00 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 19.00 | 19.00 | 15.00 | 15.00 | 10.00 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 9.00 | 9.00 | 9.00 | 9.00 | 8.00 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2020-FFY 2025 SPP development, the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinators, Specialists, and School Administrators serving as ROP’s SSIP Core Team with regular updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors and Chiefs. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading 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 | x[[16]](#footnote-17) | 260 | 669 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | x13 | 5 | 14 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x13 | x13 | x13 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x13 | x13 | x13 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x13 | x13 | x13 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x13 | x13 | x13 |

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**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 | 241 | 257 | 664 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 4 | 5 | 14 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x[[17]](#footnote-18) | x14 | x14 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x14 | x14 | x14 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x14 | x14 | x14 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x14 | x14 | x14 |

**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 4 | x14 | x14 | 33.49 | 33.10 | 14.05 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x14 | x14 | 48.88 | 45.00 | 38.46 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x14 | x14 | 49.23 | 45.00 | 34.23 | 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 | x14 | x14 | -9.81 | 10.00 | -16.70 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x14 | x14 | 19.84 | 19.00 | 21.40 | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | x14 | x14 | 9.01 | 9.00 | 5.92 | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 19% by 2.40% with a FFY 2021 performance gap of 21.40% and reported slippage by 1.56% from FFY 2020 performance gap of 19.84%. The 21.40% proficiency gap was between the performance of x% (x/5)17 for 8th graders with IEPs and 21.40% (55/257) for all 8th graders.

Possible reasons or considerations for the slippage includes the shift to online learning in January 2022 for a month and teacher shortage in all the public schools due to the immediate enforcement of the Ministry’s new hiring policy for new teachers. The availability of online classes was a response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In January 2022, the surge of COVID-19 cases required all schools to transition from face-to-face to online learning until mid-February 2022. This shift in learning mode might have contributed to the slippage in performance.

To improve student achievement, beginning school year 2022-2023, the Ministry adopted a year-round school year calendar with 185 days per year instead of the traditional 180 days or a nine-month school calendar. In addition, the Ministry’s efforts continue to prioritize teacher training in reading and math evidenced-based practices, Instructional Coaching, Accelerated Reading, Be Able Reading Program, Singapore Math, and Response to Instruction. The Special Education Program also supports schools with on-going technical assistance to increase knowledge on disabilities and intervention strategies.

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

## 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 | 100.00% | 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**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**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))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

ROP is a unitary system and does not include LEAs. Therefore, determination of "significant discrepancy" is based on data comparison of two groups - students without disabilities and students with disabilities.
Definition of “significant discrepancy”: Reported in the FFY 2006 APR, resubmitted in April 2008, ROP continues to define significant discrepancy as a relative difference that exceeds .5.
This is calculated as follows:
(a) % of suspensions > 10 days for students with disabilities equals # of students with disabilities suspended/expelled divided by # of students with disabilities enrolled in school year.
(b) % of suspensions > 10 days for students without disabilities equals # of students without disabilities suspended/expelled divided by # of students without disabilities enrolled in school year.
The difference in the rates of suspension between (a) and (b) equals (a) – (b). The relative difference in the rates of suspension/expulsion equals (a) – (b) / (b).
FFY 2021 reported data represent the one-year data lag requirement with the relative difference calculated as follows using data from 2020-2021: 0% (0/97=students with disabilities) – 1.39% (30/2162=students without disabilities) = 0-1.39/1.39 = -1 Relative Difference.

**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.**

In FFY 2021, ROP did not report significant discrepancy and did not identify noncompliance.

ROP reviewed its policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to determine if ROP demonstrated noncompliance with the Part B requirements as a result of the review required under 34 CFR Section 300.170(b). ROP assures that its policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards comply with the IDEA requirements.

ROP has Special Education Specialists assigned to schools to support the procedural implementation of IDEA. These Special Education Specialists work closely with the school principals to ensure that the IDEA procedural safeguards are provided for each student with an IEP. The Special Education Teachers complete and submit the weekly activity form to the Special Education Office every Friday. This form includes student absences and suspension data. The Special Education Specialists review the completed weekly activity form to determine if there is an attendance issue or a potential for any procedural noncompliance.

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:**

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 4B does not apply to Palau.

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 4B- Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 57.00% | 60.00% | 62.00% |  | 54.00% |
| A | 57.14% | Data | 63.95% | 59.15% | 60.00% | 57.14% | 54.22% |
| B | 2019 | Target <= | 12.00% | 11.00% | 11.00% |  | 14.00% |
| B | 14.29% | Data | 17.44% | 16.90% | 13.75% | 14.29% | 13.25% |
| C | 2019 | Target <= | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% |  | 0.00% |
| C | 0.00% | Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 54.00% | 54.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| Target B <= | 13.00% | 13.00% | 11.00% | 11.00% | 11.00% |
| Target C <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**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 | 95 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 13 |
| 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 | 0 |
| 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 |  |
| 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 | 45 | 95 | 54.22% | 54.00% | 47.37% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 13 | 95 | 13.25% | 13.00% | 13.68% | Did not meet 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 | 95 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | ROP FFY 2021 5A did not meet target at 54% by 6.63%, with 5A data of 47.37% (45/95). ROP’s 5A performance represented slippage when compared with the previous year’s performance of 54.22% (45/83). With the increase of enrollment by 12 students, the number of students in 5A at 80% or more of the school day remained the same. The increase of 12 in student enrollment were counted under the category of LRE at 40%-79% and increased the total number by two students in 5B: less than 40% compared to the previous year, which made a difference and the slippage.The 5A percentage change was due to students with IEPs moving from outlying island schools to the main island schools who needed additional individualized attention and support based on the school IEP team decision.It is understood that the school IEP team’s decision and the provision of LRE, placement is determined based on the particular student needs. The school IEP Team considers the student’s academic progress, behavior, and supports needed to determine the extent of special education services to be provided. Through teacher observations and collection of data, the school IEP team determines that the student may need and benefit from a more specialized program/instruction with more intensive interventions, individualized attention, and supports, which would be the reason for the 5A 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 = [(# 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) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # 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 >= | 83.00% | 86.00% | 100.00% |  | 85.00% |
| **A** | Data | 100.00% | 66.67% | 0.00% | 83.33% | 100.00% |
| **B** | Target <= | 1.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |  | 0.00% |
| **B** | Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**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** | 2019 | 83.33% |
| **B** | 2019 | 0.00% |
| **C** | 2020 | 0.00% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| 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 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| 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 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility |  |  |  |  |
| c1**.** Numberof 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 | 10 | 10 | 100.00% | 85.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 0 | 10 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Home | 0 | 10 | 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 | 2008 | Target >= | 90.00% | 95.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 85.00% |
| A1 | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% |  | 100.00% |  | 100.00% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 62.50% | 63.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% |
| A2 | 100.00% | Data | 33.33% |  | 0.00% |  | 0.00% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 73.00% | 74.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 85.00% |
| B1 | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% |  | 100.00% |  | 100.00% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 52.00% | 53.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% |
| B2 | 100.00% | Data | 33.33% |  | 0.00% |  | 0.00% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 66.00% | 68.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 85.00% |
| C1 | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% |  | 100.00% |  | 100.00% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 66.00% | 67.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% |
| C2 | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% |  | 0.00% |  | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 85.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% | 100.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 20.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 75.00% | 100.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 85.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% | 100.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 20.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 75.00% | 100.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 85.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 95.00% | 100.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 20.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 75.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

10

**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 | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 7 | 70.00% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 30.00% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 10 | 10 | 100.00% | 85.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3 | 10 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 20.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 5 | 50.00% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 30.00% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 8 | 10 | 100.00% | 85.00% | 80.00% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3 | 10 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 10.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 6 | 60.00% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 30.00% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |

| **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.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 9 | 10 | 100.00% | 85.00% | 90.00% | Met target | No 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3 | 10 | 0.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B1** | ROP did not meet its FFY 2021 target of 85% by 5% with a FFY2021 performance of 80% (8/10). Summary Statement 1 reported slippage from 100% (7/7) in FFY 2020 to 80% (8/10) in FFY 2021. There are factors that could have contributed to the slippage in this area of measurement but the small “n” size of three preschoolers in FFY 2020 versus two preschoolers in FFY 2021 who were functioning within age expectation upon exiting the program should also be considered as well. A change by one in number significantly changes the performance percentageThe two preschoolers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers (category b) in FFY 2021 included preschoolers who had excessive absences and/or who were identified and started receiving services at the age of four and five. The excessive absences were due to family issues. Duration of services is also a factor that may have contributed to the low rating as students were identified at four or five years old, so the amount of time they received services were not enough to help them progress to at least functioning nearer to same-aged peers (category c) upon exiting the program. ROP will continue working with partner agencies in providing supports for parents to help them improve their children’s development in this measurement as well as improve the notion of Child Find for early identification. ROP Special Education Program is a member of the High-Risk committee at the Ministry of Health Services. This committee identifies young children with special needs, which facilitates the supports needed for the families. In addition, membership on the committee allows for a smoother transition to early childhood special education services for children with disabilities upon reaching three years of age. ROP Special Education Program will also continue to work with the partner agencies on training and technical assistance activities for increasing the knowledge and skills of early childhood providers, including Head Start teachers, to improve early childhood outcomes for preschoolers with disabilities.  |

**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.**

The ROP Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Preschool Outcome Measurement System Procedural Manual is used to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices for gathering child outcome data for the three outcome measures. The ECSE and Head Start Program staff reviewed the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) measurement system procedures and the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) forms, which include the "bucket list" concept that provides a description of a child's functioning compared to age appropriate skills. Multiple sources of information are used in determining a child's status relating to the three preschool outcomes. The summary information for child outcomes is expected to take into account the child's functioning across a full range of situations and settings. Therefore, information from individuals in contact with the child is considered in deciding on outcomes. Multiple sources include but are not limited to: Parent input/observation, service provider/s observation, assessment/evaluation results, and child progress reports from service providers.

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed 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?  | YES |
| If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? | YES |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Preschool | 2005 | Target >= | 91.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% | 93.00% | 90.00% |
| Preschool | 88.00% | Data | 85.71% | 100.00% | 71.43% | 100.00% | 92.86% |
| School age | 2013 | Target >= | 98.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 97.00% |
| School age | 97.47% | Data | 90.00% | 96.83% | 98.65% | 94.74% | 97.33% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% |
| Target B >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 97.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately**

| **Group** | **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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 12 | 13 | 92.86% | 90.00% | 92.31% | Met target | No Slippage |
| School age | 76 | 79 | 97.33% | 95.00% | 96.20% | Met target | No Slippage |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

94

**Percentage of respondent parents**

97.87%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate  | 98.89% | 97.87% |

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

With a consistently high response rate each year of over 95%, ROP will continue to utilize the strategies for disseminating and collecting the parent surveys to respond to indicator 8.

In March 2022, the special education program coordinator sent a written letter to the chief of school management and head start informing them of the upcoming annual survey of parents whose children receive special education services. Included with the letter were the survey forms and letters addressed to the parents informing them of this activity.

The letter to the chief of school management and head start also requested assistance from the school special education teachers to disseminate and collect the envelopes from the parents/guardians. It also asks the teachers and assigned consulting resource teachers to follow-up. For the surveys distributed to the parents of preschoolers with disabilities, the head start program disability coordinator disseminated and collected the surveys and sent them to the Special Education office for analysis.

**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.**

An analysis of the response rate to determine any nonresponse bias was conducted. The analysis included a review of the survey tool, dissemination process, and response items. The parent survey was developed in both English and Palauan. The Palauan translation was completed by the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) parent representatives. Having the survey in Palauan addresses access by the majority of families in Palau who are considered English language learners. The dissemination process includes the schools encouraging parents to complete the survey. An envelope is provided with the survey for parents to submit their completed survey. This assures parents that their survey responses will not be viewed by school personnel.

The invalid responses to survey items were also reviewed. The surveys completed by parents of preschoolers with IEPs included responses for all items. For the school-age survey, an invalid response was noted for some of the survey demographic items, but these invalid responses were not from just one respondent. This indicates that parents might have missed the item or chose not to respond to the demographic item.

The FFY 2021 high survey return rate of 97.87% (92/94) reported two parents - one from preschool and one from school-age - who did not complete the survey. A review of the demographics of these two children were similar to the respondent children. The respondents therefore represented the broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. This analysis will be conducted each year to determine improvements for reducing the potential nonresponse bias.

**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.**

In FFY 2021, the total number of surveys disseminated was 94; of which, 14 surveys were from parents of preschoolers with an IEP and 80 surveys were from parents of school-age students with an IEP:

Preschool survey return rate = 92.86% (13/14)
School-Age survey return rate = 98.75% (79/80)

ROP reports that the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. At the time of dissemination, all children with an IEP were accounted for in the dissemination of the parent survey. The return rate for preschoolers with an IEP was 92.86% (13/14); of which one survey was not returned. For school-age students with an IEP, the return rate was 98.75% (79/80). One of the 80 surveys disseminated was not returned. ROP reviewed the ethnicity and schools/setting for determining representation.

The breakdown by ethnicity of respondents included two OSEP ethnicity categories: Other Pacific Islander and Asian, which is consistent with ROP's 618 Child Count ethnicity categories at the time of the survey dissemination. Using the +/-3% discrepancy calculation, both age groups - preschool and school-age - did not exceed the +/-3% difference for ethnicity of the target population (Child Count) and respondents. Similarly, by Head Start Centers and schools, the setting/schools or location did not exceed the +/-3% difference of the target population (Child Count) and respondents.

With an overall exceptionally high return rate of 97.87% (92/94), the demographics of the respondents is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

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

YES

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

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

The metric of +/-3% discrepancy calculation was used for this year's survey analysis. As reported earlier, ROP's overall response rate was 97.87% (92/94), an exceptionally high return rate.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

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

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 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.**

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 9 does not apply to Palau.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for 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**

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 10 does not apply to Palau.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 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 | 67.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 94.44% | 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 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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | 13 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

0

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

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The evaluation data was taken from the database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022. This database was established specifically for tracking the timeline requirement for Indicator 11 within the Special Education Data System (SEDS).

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

Procedures to Collect Data: Following the Palau Special Education Procedural Handbook that aligns with the IDEA regulatory requirements, the Special Education Specialists (also known as Consulting Resource Teachers-CRTs) are responsible for documenting the initial evaluation process in the established special education forms. These completed forms are then transmitted to the Special Education Office for data input into the SEDS. The original completed forms are securely maintained at the child’s school, while a copy of the completed forms is securely maintained in the Special Education Office.

**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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

 a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

 b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

 c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

 d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

 e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

 f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 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.**

YES

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

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 12 does not apply to Palau. Palau does not receive IDEA Part C funding.

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 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 | 98.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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**

| **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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14 | 15 | 100.00% | 100% | 93.33% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The reason for slippage is due to one student's post secondary goals and transition services were developed after his 16th birthday. This student was still attending an elementary school at one of the outer islands when he turned 16. A finding was not issued during the June 2022 offsite monitoring because the student's post secondary goals and transition services were developed and incorporated into his IEP within a month from his 16th birthday. The education specialist (also known as the consulting resource teacher/CRT) assigned to the school will monitor to ensure compliance with this requirement.

**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.**

Data Source: The secondary transition data was taken from the database system of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition for the report year July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022. This database was established specifically for tracking the timeline requirement for Indicator 13 within the Special Education Data System (SEDS).

Procedures to Collect Data: Following the Palau Special Education Procedural Handbook that aligns with the IDEA regulatory requirements, the Special Education Specialists (also known as Consulting Resource Teachers-CRTs) are responsible for assuring that the school IEP teams document the required components for secondary transition in the special education forms. These completed forms are then transmitted to the Special Education Office for data input into the SEDS. The original completed forms are securely maintained at the child’s school, while a copy of the completed forms is securely maintained in the Special Education Office.

| **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

Because the ROP reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the ROP must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the ROP must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 SPP/APR, the ROP must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
If the ROP did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the ROP did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# 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 | 2009 | Target >= | 40.00% | 45.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% |
| A | 11.00% | Data | 40.00% | 40.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 53.00% | 54.00% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 0.00% |
| B | 56.00% | Data | 60.00% | 60.00% | 20.00% | 11.11% | 0.00% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 85.00% | 90.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 30.00% |
| C | 100.00% | Data | 100.00% | 70.00% | 60.00% | 66.67% | 33.33% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 10.00% | 10.00% | 15.00% | 20.00% | 25.00% |
| Target B >= | 10.00% | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 57.00% |
| Target C >= | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% | 80.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 4 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 4 |
| Response Rate | 100.00% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 3 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 0 |
| 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) | 0 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 0 |

| **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) | 3 | 4 | 0.00% | 10.00% | 75.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 3 | 4 | 0.00% | 10.00% | 75.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 3 | 4 | 33.33% | 40.00% | 75.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

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

**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.**

Not applicable. All leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, as in the previous reporting year.

**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.**

Not applicable. All leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, as in the previous reporting year.

**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.**

The FFY 2021 Indicator 14 actual data of leavers are the 618 exiters from 2020-2021. All leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, as in the previous reporting year. The response data therefore are representative of the demographics of youth who were no longer in secondary 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).**

Not applicable. All leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, as in the previous year.

| **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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**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**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**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)**

Per OSEP's instruction, Palau is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions are held.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

ROP reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. The ROP is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 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**

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

**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)**

Per OSEP's instruction, Palau is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations are held.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

ROP reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. ROP is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 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, is 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, is 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, 2023for 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, 2023for 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)?**

Increased percentage of students with and without disabilities in grades 1-3 in the target school performing at the proficient level in ROP’s state-wide assessments for Reading.

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

NO

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

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

ROP's SSIP represents a subset of children with disabilities in ROP. ROP's SIMR targets grades 1-3 in one elementary school.

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

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP%20Theory%20of%20Action\_508%20Compliant.pdf

The Theory of Action remains the same with the long-term outcomes referencing the state-wide assessments instead of the PERA, which is the change in the data source.

**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)**

YES

**Historical Data**

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A | 2021 | 46.04% |
| B | 2021 | x[[18]](#footnote-19) |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 46.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% |
| Target B >= | 25.00% | 25.00% | 27.00% | 29.00% | 31.00% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | Students in Grades 1-3 at the Target School Who Scored at Proficient or Above | Students in Grades 1-3 at the Target School Who Took the State-Wide Assessment and Received a Valid Score | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| A | 93 | 202 | 60.55% | 46.00% | 46.04% | N/A | N/A |
| B | x[[19]](#footnote-20) | 4 | 0.00% | 25.00% | x[[20]](#footnote-21) | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

The data source has changed from the Palau English Reading Assessment (PERA) to ROP's state-wide assessments (IOWA and the portfolio system for the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS)). The reason for the change in the data source is because the Ministry has shifted its priorities for measuring student achievement. Beginning school year 2021-2022, the Ministry’s implementation of the IOWA assessments included grades 1 and 2, and effective school year 2022-2023, discontinued the use of PERA.

The IOWA assessment was identified by the ROP Ministry of Education (MOE) as the National Standardized Student Assessment to meet the mandate by Palau Public Law 10-10 (RPPL 10-10). It is a norm-reference test that compares student achievement levels to established benchmarks and tracking academic preparedness for college readiness and careers. It monitors growth using a continuous, researched-based, vertical scale to accurately measure academic progress of students.

The IOWA assessment is administered in the Spring each year. It was first administered in Spring 2018 for students in grades 3-11 until Spring 2022 when it was administered for students in grades 1-11. The test scores guide the management, school principals, program coordinators, teachers and parents, curriculum and professional developers, and policy decision-makers to evaluate education systems and make adjustments for improvements. It is designed to inform Instruction for student centered learning to personalize instructions to improve teaching and learning.

The normal distribution curve measurement indicating scaled scores by national percentile rank (NPR) and national stanine (NS) measures the students test scores by ranking (NPR) and average scores (NS) of the students who took the test in grades 1-11 in all schools in Palau. There are three performance levels (below average, average, above average). Proficient is defined as at least 23rd percentile. The results are reported at three levels; Palau-wide or National level, Building or School level, and Class or Student level.

As displayed in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR data tables, the two target measures were of grades 1-3 at the target school. For this reporting period, there were no students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at the target school that required an AA-AAAS. The state-wide assessment data reported were from the IOWA Reading assessment.

A = All students in grades 1-3 the target school who performed at the proficient level in the state-wide assessment in Reading.
B = Students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at the target school who performed at the proficient level in the state-wide assessment in Reading.

The FFY 2021 data for "A" includes all students in grades 1-3, inclusive of students with an IEP, in the target school who took the state-wide assessment and received a valid score. There was a total of 202 students in grades 1-3 at the target school who took the state-wide assessment in Reading and received a valid score. Of the total (denominator), 93 students in grades 1-3 scored proficient or above (numerator). Overall, the percentage was 46.04% (93/202) for ROP's FFY 2021 performance for “A.” By grades, the breakdown was as follows:

Grade 1 = 64.06% (41/64)
Grade 2 = 39.06% (25/64)
Grade 3 = 36.49% (27/74)

The FFY 2021 data for “B” includes students with an IEP in grades 1-3 in the target school who took the state-wide assessment and received a valid score. There was a total of four students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at the target school who took the state-wide assessment in Reading and received a valid score. Of the total (denominator), x studentx with an IEP in grades 1-3 scored proficient or above (numerator). Overall, the percentage was x% (x/4) for ROP’s FFY 2021 performance for “B.” Because of the small "n" size, ROP reports the students with IEP data as an overall percentage and total number and not by grade-level.

In January 2023, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members recommended to re-establish baseline and revise targets because the data source changed from PERA to state-wide assessments or the summative assessments in Reading. The PERA data were of the reading comprehension element, whereas the IOWA and AA-AAAS data assesses overall reading skills. ROP therefore updated the Historical Data table to indicate baseline in FFY 2021 and the Targets table includes the revised targets for FFY 2021 to FFY 2025.

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

The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Division of School Testing and Data Collection facilitates the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the IOWA assessments in all schools. During assessment the school principal supervises the administration of the assessment while teachers administers the test to their students and an assigned Ministry of Education staff is present as the test monitor. The assessment is administered in 2 days with an additional day to accommodate those who were absent and students with disabilities. Test times varies from 30 minutes to 45 minutes, additional time is given in increments of 10 minutes. Other accommodations are also provided based on student IEPs.

The Special Education Program supports the schools to implement the AA-AAAS for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The AA-AAAS portfolio system is implemented by the special education teacher most familiar with the student. The scoring and interpretation of results are facilitated by the Special Education Program.

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

YES

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

The Reading Success Network (RSN) is used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to assess progress toward the SIMR. It is an interim assessment administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year.

Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment. The practice tests will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intercession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform lesson plans, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed.

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

NO

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

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

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

http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP.SSIPEvaluationPlan\_508%20Compliant.pdf

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

NO

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

Coherent Strategy (CS) #1: (Evaluation Plan CS #1a & b): CS #1 activities assessed teacher perceptions of their knowledge, skills, and attitudes for implementing evidence-based reading instruction through participation in professional development activities focused on the use of data and identifying appropriate reading interventions for struggling learners. Coaching support was implemented with observations conducted to assess teacher behavior changes.

MOE Training and Technical Assistance: As part of the MOE system of supports, MOE implemented professional development for the target school on the use of data and identifying appropriate reading interventions. In addition, specific training sessions were held for the target school related to the IEP development and implementation (CS #3b). All schools implemented the Professional Learning Community (PLC) framework for grade-level and vertical grade-level teams to meet and discuss student data and instructional support needs. At the SSIP target school, the grade-level PLCs met every Monday afternoon with scheduled times for vertical grade-level teams – grades 1-3 – to meet.

Instructional Coaching: Beginning school year 2021-2022, MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. The PICP utilizes the Palau Professional Learning framework developed in partnership with the Palau Community College and the Regional Education Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific) at McREL International. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers. The instructional coaching support utilizes a team approach that includes an education specialist teaming with the school principal to support the identified teacher. Because this is the first year of implementation, MOE facilitated a virtual training series conducted by an off-island consultant. At the SSIP target school, the coaching team identified a new 3rd grade teacher. Specific processes, including planning meetings and observations, are being implemented. MOE tools have been developed to document the support provided and the outcomes related to changes in instructional practices.

MOE Observation Tool: This tool consists of elements for the seven teaching standards which cover aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development, which support evidence of teacher behavior changes. The SSIP target school observations were conducted in 2021-2022 and the first semester of 2022-2023.

CS #2: (Evaluation Plan CS #2): The Reading Success Network (RSN) was used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to assess progress toward the SIMR. The RSN is an interim assessment administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year, for the purpose of measuring student progress.

Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments. The practice tests will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intercession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform lesson plans, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed.

CS #3: (Evaluation Plan CS #3a, b, & c): CS #3 incorporated a systematic process for improving instruction through the use of data to inform how teachers can modify and/or adjust teaching and learning in the classroom to improve reading instruction. Data collection, analysis, interpretation, and application are a cyclical process. The CS #3 activities established written Standard of Practice (SOP) for a systematic student data review process, also known as progress monitoring.

The student data review process includes the use of the Student Reading Profile for identifying struggling learners and to keep track of their performance and intervention needs. Implementation was noted to begin in school year 2021-2022. This included understanding the use of the PERA and RSN data results at the grade, classroom, and individual student levels. The MOE education specialists continued to provide professional development related to data literacy and instructional strategies. In January 2022, the first session on intensive intervention was held to demonstrate how using student data can lead to understanding what interventions are needed in addition to the core instruction. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the increased number of positive cases in Palau, schools were closed beginning January 17, 2022 and instruction transitioned to remote learning, with the younger grades receiving instructional packets (paper-based learning). This school closure included the transition from in-person professional development to virtual training activities. The first session in January 2022 was therefore conducted virtually with technical support from University of Guam CEDDERS. The MOE education specialists utilized the “User Guide for the Sample Reading Lessons” and video resources available through the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII). The virtual sessions continued through April 2022 to support the SSIP target school understand how to determine needed intensive interventions based on student data and the use of progress monitoring.

CS #4: (Evaluation Plan CS #4): Starting with 1st grade will be important. Starting with preschool will be even more critical. MOE has two Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with the Head Start Program: One for special education child find and the other for MOE as an educational system. The collaboration focus for CS #4 has been on the collaborative partnership between MOE and Head Start to address the grade retention rate of 1st graders.

MOE continued to collaborate with the Head Start Program to schedule the 1st grade student orientation day that included administering the first part of the 1st grade RSN screening. MOE requested the Head Start Program to include data sharing in the MOU to incorporate student data information into the MOE student data system as part of the transition of preschoolers to first grade.

Beginning school year 2022-2023, MOE opened the school year with Kindergartners in all MOE elementary schools. Currently, the SSIP target school has one Kindergarten class. This change would need to be examined in relation to how CS #4 will be adjusted, if needed, to address the continued collaborative efforts between MOE and the Head Start Program.

**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.**

School Year 2021-2022 welcomed a new Minister of Education and Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). With the Director of the Bureau of School Operations, the MOE leadership team transformed the Ministry’s organizational structure to streamline programs and services that directly impact student learning under the supervision of the BCI. The BCI now includes three Divisions: School Testing and Data Collection; Curriculum Development and Implementation; and Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing Education. These BCI Divisions ensure system coherence between assessment, curriculum, and instruction enhanced through training and technical assistance to strengthen the teacher and learning dynamic. The Special Education Program continues to be under the BCI as one of the programs that directly impact student learning. This new Governance system framework re-prioritizes how the Ministry operates to improve student achievement for all students. Beginning school year 2022-2023, system changes include implementing:
• A year-round school schedule. The academic year begins in July with the school year divided into four quarters with a short intercession between each quarter.
• Kindergarten in all elementary schools.
• Increased reading/language arts instructional time to 90 minutes each school day.
• Targeted training in areas for improvement based on student data implemented in smaller groups or school-specific sessions.

The SSIP focus continues to align with the Ministry’s new Governance system framework. The SSIP short-term and intermediate outcomes achieved by coherent strategy supports the overall Ministry focus on improving student achievement. The mechanisms for improvement used by the SSIP target school provide relevant data and information for how the system changes support teachers and students. As communicated by the MOE leadership, the SSIP is not a “thing.” It is what we do to improve student outcomes. It is a process within the system improvement efforts of the Ministry that addresses specific infrastructure improvement needs of the schools through an additional lens on one school. What we learn from the SSIP target school will assist with understanding how the system supports all schools.

CS #1: Systems framework = data, professional development (PD), technical assistance (TA). The annual pre/post self-assessment tool was developed specifically for the SSIP activities. This tool has been incorporated into MOE training activities. The use of existing MOE tools support system changes and sustainability of improvement efforts. With the infrastructure changes in the Ministry beginning school year 2022-2023, the SSIP target school continued to support the impact of the overall MOE system improvement efforts for increasing English literacy proficiency. The systems framework of data, PD, and TA provide targeted support in all schools and not just for the SSIP target school.

The CS #1 short-term outcomes target increased knowledge, skills, and attitudes for implementing evidence-based practices (EBP) in reading instruction. The CS #1 intermediate outcomes target increased implementation of EBP in reading instruction. As outlined in the ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan, the training evaluation and observation tools were used to assist in determining the extent teachers have increased knowledge, skills, and attitudes that can be seen in teacher behavior changes.

In previous years, the pre/post self-assessments have shown an increase in teacher perceptions of knowledge and skills related to English literacy EBP, with minimal change in teacher behaviors for implementing English literacy EBP. The observation data conducted during the first semester of school year 2021-2022 and school year 2022-2023 showed positive changes in teacher behaviors at the SSIP target school. Based on the observation data, teachers are demonstrating application of the English literacy EBP in the classrooms.

CS #2: Systems framework = data, quality standards, PD, TA. RSN is used to collect and report secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to measure progress towards meeting the SIMR. Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP’s state-wide assessment.

CS #2 addresses the systems framework related to data, quality standards, PD, and TA. A consideration with the system implementation of the RSN is that it is administered by the one SSIP target school with the intent to scale-up its use in other schools. However, with the MOE Intersession Practice Tests being administered in all schools, reviewing the use of both assessment tools at the target school will assist in determining if these assessments are duplicative or complementary. The RSN provides student-level information to identify areas of focus for instructional supports and interventions. Similarly, the MOE Intersession Practice Test is designed to inform instruction. CS #2 short-term and intermediate outcomes target increased knowledge and skills on the administration of the interim assessment and the ability to administer the interim assessment. With fidelity of administration, student results data will help in targeting specific skills development through individualized and/or small group interventions. For this year’s administration of the RSN, the CS #2 short-term and intermediate outcomes continued to demonstrate fidelity of administration.

CS #3: Systems framework = data, PD, TA. As discussed earlier, CS #3 incorporates a systematic process for improving instruction through the use of data to inform how teachers can modify and/or adjust teaching and learning in the classroom to improve reading instruction. This process is designed to identify and support the intervention needs of struggling learners, inclusive of students with disabilities.

The CS #3 short-term and intermediate outcomes relate to increasing knowledge, skills, and use of student data for identifying struggling learners and monitoring student progress. Student data and teacher feedback identified the need for additional training on identifying and implementing intensive intervention. The MOE education specialists developed a training series that utilized the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) resources for data decision-making and identifying interventions. The virtual training series started in January 2022 and continued through April 2022 for the target school. In addition, MOE partnered with the PROGRESS Center, an OSEP-funded center, that supports teachers in the development and implementation of the IEP. The PROGRESS Center resources complements the NCII resources targeting the program development needs of students with an IEP.

CS #4: Systems framework = governance and TA. A major infrastructure change for MOE was the start of Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023. This change will be examined in school year 2022-2023 to determine how CS #4 will be adjusted, if needed, to address continued collaborative efforts between MOE and the Head Start Program.

The CS #4 short-term and intermediate outcomes have focused on increased knowledge and skills by both organizations, MOE and the Head Start Program, on the implementation of collaborative early literacy activities and data sharing. Meetings have been held between MOE and the Head Start Program regarding how collaborative early literacy activities are critical for increasing early literacy skills in preschoolers as they enter elementary school, which now includes Kindergarten.

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

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

CS #1: Beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. The PICP utilizes the Palau Professional Learning framework developed in partnership with the Palau Community College and the Regional Education Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific) at McREL International. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers. School year 2022-2023 will provide implementation data related to the PICP.

CS #2: Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment. The practice tests will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intercession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform lesson plans, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed. School year 2022-2023 will provide information on the use of the two assessment tools, the RSN and the practice tests, at the target school to determine if these assessments are duplicative or complementary.

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

Following the ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan strategies/activities, identified next steps and anticipated outcomes for each Coherent Strategy (CS) as follows:

CS#1: The use of the MOE Observation Tool will support the evidence of implementation of EBP – teacher behavior changes. This will be supported by the new instructional coaching framework of the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). The MOE PICP replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers. School year 2022-2023 will provide implementation data related to the PICP.

Next Steps: Continued use of the observations at the target school and implementation of the PICP (coaching).

Anticipated Outcomes: Increased application of early literacy EBP will result in increased reading proficiency in the early grades.

CS#2: The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment in the target school. Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment.

Next Steps: With the introduction of the MOE Intercession Practice Tests in school year 2022-2023, the scale-up plan for the RSN was not implemented in school year 2022-2023. School year 2022-2023 will provide information on the use of the two assessment tools, the RSN and the practice tests, at the target school to determine if these assessments are duplicative or complementary.

Anticipated Outcomes: MOE BCI leadership will assess the effectiveness of using both the RSN and the MOE Intercession Practice Tests. Currently, the RSN is limited to the SSIP activities and the MOE Intercession Practice Tests is administered in all schools.

CS#3: Although sessions have been conducted to review the Focus of Concern (FOC) Standard Operating Procedures, teachers expressed a need for continued support, including examples of how to complete the process. In addition, teacher feedback from training sessions indicated the need for additional training on interventions for struggling learners.

Next Steps: Continuation of targeted training related to the identification and implementation of intensive interventions for struggling learners, inclusive of the development and implementation of IEPs. The development of case studies of students with an IEP to gauge teacher behavior change for improving instructional practices for students with disabilities.

Anticipated Outcomes: Incorporating the NCII, PROGRESS Center, and other nationally recognized center resources into existing MOE resources and supports will increase the likelihood of sustaining the supports beyond SSIP. The MOE BCI leadership has prioritized enhancing their MOE website to be a source for stakeholders to access relevant resources related to student achievement, inclusive of resources for students with disabilities. In addition, student data for students with an IEP will indicate improved progress of their Reading skills.

CS#4: MOU between MOE & the Head Start Program in effect with a request by MOE to include data sharing. A major infrastructure change for MOE was the start of Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023. This change will be examined in school year 2022-2023 to determine how CS #4 will be adjusted, if needed, to address continued collaborative efforts between MOE and the Head Start Program.

Next Step: MOE opening Kindergarten classes for five-year old students in all elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023 will require meeting with the Head Start Program to identify continued collaborative activities in early literacy development.

Anticipated Outcomes: Continued collaboration between the Head Start Program and MOE will result in increased opportunities for joint activities to promote early literacy development.

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

The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment
Differentiated Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction
Instructional Coaching

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment: The RSN is used to collect and report secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to measure progress towards meeting the SIMR. With technical support from the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), the RSN is considered an interim assessment administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year, for the purposes of measuring progress, which is the intent of the use of the RSN to measure progress towards the SIMR.

Differentiated Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (UDL): As part of the core instruction and multi-tiered system of supports, differentiated instruction and UDL aims to personalize lessons to accommodate struggling learners in the classroom and to ensure that all students have access to the curriculum. UDL is designed to improve student access and skills in order to become a proficient reader.

Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction: These are key instructional principles for improving academic skills. Explicit instruction utilizes the “model, lead, and test” framework of instruction. Teachers model and provide guided practice until the students are able to independently apply the skills. Systematic instruction is the instructional process for developing simple to complex skills. It is providing a logical sequence for learning. These two key instructional principles have been part of the MOE intensive intervention training series using the NCII resources.

Instructional Coaching: As discussed earlier, beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. The PICP utilizes the Palau Professional Learning framework developed in partnership with the Palau Community College and the Regional Education Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific) at McREL International. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers.

**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.**

In Phase I, ROP developed its Theory of Action “if-then” statements to outline the relationship between what MOE does and the intended outcomes related to teachers, students, and the system. If ROP implements the coherent strategies (CS), then there will be short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes. Each CS incorporates relevant EBP to meet the intended outcomes. The ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan was developed to collect and analyze data and information in response to the intended outcomes framed as evaluation questions. The evaluation questions followed the same “if-then” process, for example, if ROP implemented professional development on EBP in Reading, then it will result in increased teacher knowledge and skills in EBP in Reading.

From the beginning, ROP’s SSIP incorporated existing MOE processes and tools for improving instruction. The intent has been to support MOE strengthen its use of EBP. The documented experiences of the SSIP target school will inform MOE about the effectiveness of its processes and tools for improving student outcomes. As discussed earlier, the change in the Ministry’s organizational structure streamlined programs and services that directly impact student learning under the supervision of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). The BCI now includes three Divisions: School Testing and Data Collection; Curriculum Development and Implementation; and Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing Education. These BCI Divisions ensure system coherence between assessment, curriculum, and instruction enhanced through training and technical assistance to strengthen the teacher and learning dynamic. The SSIP efforts have shifted to targeted support prioritized through the review of data and information and communication between the target school Principal, Special Education Program Coordinator, and the Chief of Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing Education. The what, why, and how of the SSIP implementation is led by the MOE BCI leadership to ensure that what we learn for the target school will influence the changes in system-wide policies, procedures, and practices.

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

ROP SSIP evaluation measures continued to be used this reporting period to measure effectiveness of the coherent strategies (CS) in meeting the intended outcomes. Evaluation of implementation is based on the scoring rubric: 0= little to no implementation, 1= some; 2= moderate; and 3= strong.

To monitor fidelity of implementation, the evaluation scoring rubric was used for the administration of the RSN (CS #2). Each administration included an observation of the teacher administering the RSN. An observation checklist was utilized to determine whether the teachers were administering the RSN to fidelity. The SSIP target school teachers showed an implementation level of “3” for the August 2021 (100% (12/12)) and November 2021 (100% (12/12)) administration, demonstrating “strong” implementation of the RSN. With consistent evidence over the years of strong implementation of the RSN administration, school year 2022-2023 SSIP activities did not include gathering observation data related to the RSN administration. Another factor for not collecting the data was that grades 1-3 teachers remained the same as the previous year.

To assess practice change, the SSIP target school observations were conducted related to early literacy elements and strategies. As reported in previous years, the results of the self-assessment surveys and training evaluations indicated that teachers increased their knowledge and skills of early literacy EBP. However, observations conducted showed little to some implementation. The updated MOE Observation Tool covered aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development intended to provide evidence of teacher behavior change. Four observations were conducted for each teacher from August 2021 to November 2021. A year later, one observation was conducted for each teacher in October and November 2022. The implementation level for each observation period showed the following:

August 2021:
CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of “0” (18.18% (2/11) of teachers observed met the standard)
CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of “0” (0% (0/11) of teachers observed met the standard)

September 2021:
CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of “1” (50% (6/12) of teachers observed met the standard)
CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of “0” (16.67% (2/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

October 2021:
CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of “2” (75% (9/12) of teachers observed met the standard)
CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of “1” (50% (6/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

November 2021:
CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of “3” (91.67% (11/12) of teachers observed met the standard)
CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of “2” (83.33% (10/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

October & November 2022:
CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of “3” (100% (8/8) of teachers observed met the standard)
CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of “3” (100% (8/8) of teachers observed met the standard)

Overall, the observation data showed improved performance from an implementation level of “0” for both Lesson Plans and EBP in August 2021 to an implementation level of “3” for Lesson Plans and “2” for EBP in November 2021 to an implementation level of “3” for both Lesson Plans and EBP. The frequency and process for conducting the observations could have contributed to the increased implementation levels. Within four months in 2021, teachers were observed four times. Then, a year later in 2022, each teacher was observed one time and the observation data showed strong implementation for both measures. The 2022 observation results indicate that teacher behaviors are changing to implement EBP in Reading instruction. Before and after each observation, a meeting was held between the observer and teacher to discuss the schedule for the observation and outcomes of the observation. This provided the teachers with feedback on what and why of the observation ratings selected before the next scheduled observation. The intentional development and implementation of targeted training for the target school could have attributed to the positive practice change seen through the observations conducted in October and November 2022. The MOE held the early literacy training in October 2021 followed by the consultant conducting a virtual observation in November 2021. In January 2022 through December 2022, targeted training for the target school teachers focused on the use of student data to identify and provide appropriate interventions and the development and implementation of IEPs for students with disabilities.

As discussed earlier, beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. School year 2022-2023 will provide implementation data related to the PICP.

**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.**

As discussed earlier, the RSN is used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, as well as gauge progress towards the SIMR. In previous years, trend and cohort data have been reviewed to identify professional development and technical assistance needs for early literacy EBP, such as the intensive intervention training series using the NCII resources and the partnership with another OSEP-funded Center, the PROGRESS Center, to support schools on the development and implementation of IEPs.

For school year 2022-2023, the RSN data revealed that the 1st grade performance in the first administration in August 2022 was significantly higher than the first administration in previous school year. The proficiency performance for the six Reading elements assessed ranged from 16% to 69% in August 2022 compared to 1% to 27% in August 2021. The second administration in December 2022 also showed higher percentages in performance for each element compared to last school year’s second administration: 32% to 86% in December 2022 compared to 14% to 79% in December 2021. In addition, the 1st grade performance for each Reading element showed an increase in percentage from the first administration in August 2022 to the second administration in December 2022. Performance data for 1st grade is reviewed more closely each year because 1st grade is the first group to enter elementary school. Most 1st graders prior to enrolling have school experience through the Head Start Program or a private preschool.

All three grades demonstrated increased percentages for all but one Reading element for one of the grades assessed in August 2022 to December 2022 from a range of percent gains for 1st grade from 17% to 30%, 2nd grade from 3% to 21%, and 3rd grade from 1% to 5%. It should be noted that the smaller percent gains reported for 2nd and 3rd grades was because their performance from the first administration to the second administration was in the 88% to 99% range. The one Reading element that did not show a percent gain from August 2022 to December 2022 was the comprehension element for 3rd graders. The data decreased slightly from 75% in August 2022 to 71% in December 2022.

RSN data are also reviewed by cohorts, in particular 1st graders who would be 2nd graders the following year. As discussed earlier, the August 2021 performance data for 1st graders were significantly low. It was discussed that this low performance was due to the impact of COVID-19 on school operations at Head Start, the year before the 1st graders started at the target school. The Head Start Program reported that they were still implementing COVID-19 preventive measures which changed the instructional routines. In August 2021, 1st grade performance in the first administration ranged from 1% to 27% for the six Reading elements. In August 2022, these 1st grade group would be the 2nd grade group that performed in the first administration with a performance range of 29% to 95%. The lowest performance percentage reported for the 2nd grade group at 29% was for the comprehension Reading element.

Data from the training sessions also support the decision to continue the ongoing use of EBP. MOE BCI leadership prioritized targeted training and technical assistance to the schools, inclusive of the SSIP target school. Based on the student data and feedback from teachers, a virtual literacy intervention training series was developed and facilitated by the BCI education specialists using the NCII resources, with technical support from Guam CEDDERS. The virtual training series included four 2-hour sessions in the evening attended by all 18 grades 1-3 and special education teachers. The series outcomes included increased knowledge in the following areas: the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), using RSN and other data to identify reading skill areas of need, identifying appropriate interventions, and accessing online resources for addressing the interventions needed, in particular through the NCII website. At the end of the series, participating teachers were asked to complete an online retro-evaluation to gauge their increased knowledge of the outcome areas. The retro-evaluation asked the teacher to rate their knowledge of the content areas before the series and after the series. The rating scale used was from 1=no knowledge to 4=high-very knowledgeable. The results revealed that the teachers increased their knowledge in all outcome areas from a mean of 2 (low) before the series to a mean of 3 (moderate) after the series. This virtual training series was also offered to another elementary school to support grades 1-3 and special education teachers address the needs of struggling learners. The retro-evaluation feedback from this elementary school was similar to the increased knowledge in the outcome areas as the target school’s feedback results.

Based on the training needs for supporting struggling learners, inclusive of students with an IEP, MOE partnered with the PROGRESS Center and Guam CEDDERS to hold a two-day in-person session and a half-day in-person follow-up session with the target school teachers. In September 2022, the two-day session was held with 20 target school teachers and special education related service providers. The outcomes of the session included increased knowledge of IDEA, educational framework and strategies, the role of each IEP team member, how to design high-quality educational programs, and accessing resources to support the development and implementation of programs through an IEP for students with disabilities. Using the same retro-evaluation form, the results of the feedback indicated increased knowledge of the session outcomes from a mean of 2 (low) before the session to a mean of 3 (moderate) after the session. The half-day follow-up session in December 2022 furthered the conversation and learning from September 2022. Based on the September 2022 feedback, the December 2022 follow-up session focused on the referral process for special education and understanding different disabilities. An open-ended feedback form was used for grade-level teams to provide their feedback. The results indicated that the session was relevant and useful.

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

The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment (CS #2): As discussed earlier, CS #2 includes the continued use of the RSN by the target school.

Next Steps: With the introduction of the MOE Intercession Practice Tests in school year 2022-2023, the scale-up plan for the RSN was not implemented. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments. IOWA is one of the state-wide assessment in Reading data source for ROP’s SIMR.

Anticipated Outcomes: MOE BCI leadership will assess the effectiveness of using both the RSN and the MOE Intercession Practice Tests. Currently, the RSN is limited to the SSIP activities and the MOE Intercession Practice Tests is administered in all schools.

Differentiated Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (CS #1): As part of the core instruction, differentiated instruction and UDL continue to be reinforce through professional development.

Next Steps: MOE education specialists will continue to support schools in the implementation of EBP. This includes offering targeted training sessions, school-level technical assistance, and implementation of the professional learning framework of the instructional coaching.

Anticipated Outcomes: Implementation of existing MOE resources and supports will increase the likelihood of sustaining the supports beyond SSIP.

Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction (CS #3): These are key instructional principles for improving academic skills. These key instructional principles have been part of the MOE intensive intervention training series using the NCII resources. Increasing knowledge and skills on the development and implementation of IEPs will support the teachers address the intervention needs of students with an IEP.

Next Steps: Continuation of targeted training related to the identification and implementation of intensive interventions for struggling learners, inclusive of the development and implementation of IEPs. The development of case studies of students with an IEP to gauge the teacher behavior change for improving instructional practices for students with disabilities. This will incorporate the student review process under CS #3.

Anticipated Outcomes: Incorporating the NCII, PROGRESS Center, and other nationally recognized center resources into existing MOE resources and supports will increase the likelihood of sustaining the supports beyond SSIP. The MOE BCI leadership has prioritized enhancing their MOE website to be a source for stakeholders to access relevant resources related to student achievement, inclusive of resources for students with disabilities. In addition, student data for students with an IEP will indicate improved progress of their Reading skills.

Instructional Coaching (CS #1): As discussed earlier, beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers.

Next Steps: Coaching data in school year 2022-2023 will assist in prioritizing targeted training and technical assistance to the schools.

Anticipated Outcomes: Increased application of early literacy EBP will result in increased reading proficiency in the early grades.

**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.**

The results from the observations, training, and RSN administration indicate that we are on track with the SSIP activities at this time. The coaching data will be reviewed in school year 2022-2023.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP’s Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP’s broad stakeholder input.

ROP’s stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP’s SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

In January 2023, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members recommended to re-establish baseline and revise targets because the data source changed from PERA to state-wide assessments or the summative assessments in Reading. The PERA data were of the reading comprehension element, whereas the IOWA and AA-AAAS data assesses overall reading skills. ROP therefore updated the Historical Data table to indicate baseline in FFY 2021 and the Targets table includes the revised targets for FFY 2021 to FFY 2025.

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

Specific strategies for engagement of stakeholders, in particular, the teachers include small group sessions to target specific training and technical assistance needs. The MOE BCI leadership has prioritized targeted support to the schools, including the SSIP target school. Improvement efforts are addressed through the on-going feedback received from principals, teachers, and parents.

**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.**

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Palau did not provide its State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Palau must provide the FFY 2021 SiMR in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Palau included its SIMR in the Indicator Data section. The data source has changed but the SIMR focus remains the same, as explained in the Indicator Data section.

## 17 - OSEP Response

ROP has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

ROP revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

**Name:**

Hasinta IdaRekoi Kilcullen

**Title:**

Director, BCI

**Email:**

ikilcullen@palauschools.org

**Phone:**

680-488-2568

**Submitted on:**

04/28/23 12:01:35 AM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

**Palau**

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination[[21]](#footnote-22)**

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 60.00% | Needs Assistance |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 8 | 0 | 0.00% |
| **Compliance** | 8 | 8 | 100.00% |

**2023 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

| **Reading Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | \* | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**Math Assessment Elements**

| **Math Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | \* | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**Exiting Data Elements**

| **Exiting Data Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years** | 29 | 0 |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years\*\*** | \* | 0 |

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

**2023 Part B Compliance Matrix**

| **Part B Compliance Indicator[[22]](#footnote-23)** | **Performance (%)**  | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 13: Secondary transition** | 93.33% | N/A | 2 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 2 |
| **Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | None |  |  |

## Data Rubric

**Palau**

FFY 2021 APR[[23]](#footnote-24)

|   | **Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3A** | 1 | 1 |
| **3B** | 1 | 1 |
| **3C** | 1 | 1 |
| **3D** | 1 | 1 |
| **4A** | 1 | 1 |
| **4B** | N/A | 0 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | N/A | 0 |
| **10** | N/A | 0 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |
| **12** | N/A | 0 |
| **13** | 1 | 1 |
| **14** | 1 | 1 |
| **15** | 1 | 1 |
| **16** | 1 | 1 |
| **17** | 1 | 1 |
|  | **Subtotal** | 17 |
| **APR Score Calculation** | **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
|  | **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 22 |

|  |  | **618 Data[[24]](#footnote-25)** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/****Ed Envs** **Due Date: 4/6/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal** | 21 |
| **618 Score Calculation** |  |  | **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | 26.00 |

| **Indicator Calculation** |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 22 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 26.00 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 48.00 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 4 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 48.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator\*) = | 1.0000 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 100.00 |

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part B 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 1st Wednesday in April |
| Part B Personnel  | C070, C099, C112 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Discipline  | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | Wednesday in the 3rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date) |
| Part B Dispute Resolution  | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in May |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

## Dispute Resolution



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

1. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Data suppressed due to small cell size [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Data suppressed due to small cell size [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Data suppressed due to smal cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Data suppressed due to smal cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Data suppressed due to smal cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B." [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)