

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Palau**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2022**

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

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Republic of Palau (ROP) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2020. 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 2020 APR.

In FFY 2020, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2025. This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the 17 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 2020 data to determine baseline, where appropriate, establish annual targets, and respond to any issue identified for the Indicator in the June 25, 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter and ROP's FFY 2019 SPP/APR.

#### 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 17 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. The Chief of the Division of School Management 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 Chief of School Management. 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 which recently included representatives of each related service areas, is now 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 partnership with PPE has improved the relationship between school and parents of children with disabilities. 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.

The Special Education Coordinator participates in the MOE quarterly meetings with all school administrators, MOE Management Team, and program coordinators and content specialists. The meetings are designed to provide updates on all MOE programs and services, including special education, and upcoming training activities and needs in the schools. 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 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.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

36

**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.**

In July 2021, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's IDEA State Advisory Panel, met to review ROP's 2021 IDEA Part B Determination for its FFY 2019 APR and to review the new SPP development requirements, including the broad stakeholder engagement.

SEAC met in December 2021 and twice in January 2022 to review ROP's FFY2020 APR performance data and trend data for each Indicator, to provide input on target setting for FFY2020-2025 SSP/APR. They will continue to prioritize effort on improving support and services for young children with disabilities pursuing higher education or training after high school.

On January 14, 2022, members of the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, met with special education coordinator and education specialists to review ROP's FFY2020 APR performance data and trend data, to provide input on target setting for each indicators for this new cycle, FFY2020-2025 SPP/APR. This meeting was

the first in extending the SPP/APR review to other parents and organizations. The meeting discussion included a commitment to meet regularly to review progress information toward meeting the SPP targets. The meeting provided an opportunity to share with parents how their involvement in their child's IEP development and implementation is translated into data and information reported to USDOE OSEP on an annual basis.

#### **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.**

As described earlier, ROP held a January meeting with members from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE) and Omekesang organizations. These organizations 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 Project funded by OSEP. The meeting included input regarding the SPP targets and a discussion and commitment to holding regular meetings and collaborative activities to ensure that the implementation of activities are reported and shared for additional input. This connection will assist with increasing input from a diverse group of parents in addition to ROP's SEAC, ROP's main stakeholder group.

#### **Soliciting Public Input:**

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

As described earlier, ROP held a January meeting with members from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE) and Omekesang organizations. These organizations 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 Project funded by OSEP. The meeting included input regarding the SPP targets and a discussion and commitment to holding regular meetings and collaborative activities to ensure that the implementation of activities are reported and shared for additional input. This connection will assist with increasing input from a diverse group of parents in addition to ROP's SEAC, ROP's main stakeholder group.

#### **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 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

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**

OSEP notes that Palau submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in the Palau's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, Palau must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

As required, for Indicator 17, ROP's FFY 2019 IDEA Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year Five Report has been posted on the following ROP MOE website: <http://173.230.128.80/?p=Special%20Education%20Program>

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

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

#### **Intro - 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.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	70.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	30.00%	40.00%		70.10%	70.10%
Data	33.33%	33.33%	70.00%	16.67%	20.00%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	30.00%	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 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.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	3	20.00%	30.00%	33.33%	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

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

#### 1 - Required Actions

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

OPTION 1:

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

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	33.33%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	7.00%	7.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	8.57%	3.33%	7.41%	18.18%	22.22%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	33.33%	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 2020-FFY 2025 SPP development, the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omeakesang, 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.

With input from ROP's stakeholders, ROP reports Option 1 data for Indicator 2 effective FFY 2020, reestablishing baseline for Indicator 2.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	3	22.22%	33.33%	33.33%	N/A	N/A

**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**

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

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

**2 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	93.33%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	94.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	93.33%	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 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 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

#### Data Source:

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

#### Date:

03/30/2022

#### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	4	5	15
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2	4	13
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1	1	1

#### Data Source:

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

#### Date:

03/30/2022

#### Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	4	5	15
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2	4	13
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1	1	1

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

### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3	4		75.00%	75.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5	5		100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	14	15		93.33%	93.33%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3	4		75.00%	75.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5	5		100.00%	100.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	14	15		93.33%	93.33%	N/A	N/A

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

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:  
<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**

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

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

**3A - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment})]$ . 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	0.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	0.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	7.69%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	50.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	25.00%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	46.15%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	7.69%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	50.00%	30.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%	60.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	46.15%	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 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 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

##### Data Source:

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

##### Date:

03/03/2022

##### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	2	4	13
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	1

##### Data Source:

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

##### Date:

03/03/2022

##### Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	2	4	13
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	1	6

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	2		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	0	4		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1	13		7.69%	7.69%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	1	2		50.00%	50.00%	N/A	N/A
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	1	4		25.00%	25.00%	N/A	N/A
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	6	13		46.15%	46.15%	N/A	N/A

### **Regulatory Information**

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

### **Public Reporting Information**

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

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 Program:  
<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**

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

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

### **3B - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	0.00%	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 2020-FFY 2025 SPP development, the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekeasang, 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 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts****Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1	1	1
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	0	0

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1	1	1
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	0	0

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

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

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

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: <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**

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

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

**3C - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	33.49	33.10	30.00	28.00	26.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	48.88	45.00	40.00	35.00	30.00	25.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	49.23	45.00	40.00	35.00	30.00	25.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	0.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	0.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	19.84	19.00	19.00	15.00	15.00	10.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	9.01	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 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 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

##### Data Source:

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

##### Date:

03/03/2022

##### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	209	223	571
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2	4	13
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	70	109	324
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	1
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	1

##### Data Source:

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

##### Date:

03/03/2022

##### Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	209	223	571
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	2	4	13
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	83	99	309
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	1	6
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	1	6

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0.00%	33.49%		33.49	33.49	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	0.00%	48.88%		48.88	48.88	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7.69%	56.92%		49.23	49.23	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	50.00%	40.19%		0.00	-9.81	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	25.00%	44.84%		19.84	19.84	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	46.15%	55.17%		9.01	9.01	N/A	N/A

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

ROP's Grade 4 Math FFY 2020 baseline data is -9.81, as shown in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment table. ROP's Historical data table indicates "0" for Grade 4 Math FFY 2020 baseline data because the EMAPS system does not accept any number less than "0". ROP has attempted to input the -9.81 for Grade 4 Math FFY 2020 baseline data and target but the EMAPS system continues to revert back to "0" for those fields.

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

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

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

OSEP notes that Palau reported that the correct data for the Grade 4 Math FFY 2020 baseline and target is -9.81. Specifically, Palau reported, "EMAPS system does not accept any number less than "0". ROP has attempted to input the -9.81 for Grade 4 Math FFY 2020 baseline data and target but the EMAPS system continues to revert back to "0" for those fields."

**3D - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

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

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

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 2020 reported data represent the one-year data lag requirement with the relative difference calculated as follows using data from 2019-2020:

0% (0/90=students with disabilities) – 1.17% (25/2136=students without disabilities) = -0.1.17/1.17 = -1 Relative Difference.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)****Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

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

In FFY 2020, 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 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

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

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

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

**4A - Required Actions**



## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

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

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

**4B- Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	55.00%	57.00%	60.00%	62.00%	
A	57.14%	Data	58.24%	63.95%	59.15%	60.00%	57.14%
B	2019	Target <=	12.00%	12.00%	11.00%	11.00%	
B	14.29%	Data	13.19%	17.44%	16.90%	13.75%	14.29%
C	2019	Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	
C	0.00%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	54.00%	54.00%	54.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Target B <=	14.00%	13.00%	13.00%	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%
Target C <=	0.00%	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 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.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	83
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	45
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	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 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	45	83	57.14%	54.00%	54.22%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11	83	14.29%	14.00%	13.25%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	83	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Palau must revise the Historical Data table to reflect FFY 2019 as the baseline year for this indicator.

### Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

As required, ROP's Indicator 5 historical data table indicates FFY 2019 as the baseline year.

## **5 - OSEP Response**

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

## **5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	83.00%	83.00%	86.00%	100.00%	
A	Data	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%	83.33%
B	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	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 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.

## 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	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

## Prepopulated Data

### Data Source:

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

### Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2	3	9	14
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	2	3	9	14
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	0	0	0	0

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

NO

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	14	14	83.33%	85.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	14	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	0	14			0.00%	N/A	N/A

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, Palau must revise the Historical Data table to reflect FFY 2019 as the baseline year for this indicator.

### Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

As required, ROP's Indicator 6 Historical Data table indicates FFY 2019 as the baseline year for 6A and 6B, and FFY 2020 as baseline year for 6C.

## 6 - OSEP Response

Palau has established the baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

Palau provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for 6A and 6B for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. Palau provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for 6C, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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

## 6 - Required Actions



## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	
A2	2008	Target >=	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	100.00%	100.00%

A2	100.00%	Data	40.00%	33.33%		0.00%	
B1	2008	Target >=	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	
B2	2008	Target >=	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B2	100.00%	Data	20.00%	33.33%		0.00%	
C1	2008	Target >=	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	100.00%	100.00%
C1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%	
C2	2008	Target >=	64.00%	66.00%	67.00%	100.00%	100.00%
C2	100.00%	Data	40.00%	100.00%		0.00%	

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Target A2 >=	0.00%	20.00%	50.00%	60.00%	75.00%	100.00%
Target B1 >=	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Target B2 >=	0.00%	20.00%	50.00%	60.00%	75.00%	100.00%
Target C1 >=	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Target C2 >=	0.00%	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 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 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

7

##### 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	100.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7	7		85.00%	100.00%	Met target	N/A
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	0	7		0.00%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

**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	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7	100.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7	7		85.00%	100.00%	Met target	N/A
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	0	7		0.00%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

**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	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	7	100.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	7	7		85.00%	100.00%	Met target	N/A
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	0	7		0.00%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

## 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 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 8 - Indicator Data

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

## Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Preschool	2005	Target ≥	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Preschool	88.00%	Data	100.00%	85.71%	100.00%	71.43%	100.00%
School age	2013	Target ≥	98.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
School age	97.47%	Data	93.42%	90.00%	96.83%	98.65%	94.74%

## Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	92.00%	92.00%
Target B ≥	97.00%	95.00%	95.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%

## FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	13	14	100.00%	90.00%	92.86%	Met target	No Slippage
School age	73	75	94.74%	97.00%	97.33%	Met target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

90

Percentage of respondent parents

98.89%

## Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	96.55%	98.89%

**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 consistent 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.

Every March of each year, the special education program coordinator sends 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 are the survey forms and letters addressed to parents informing them of this activity.

The letter to the chief of school management and head start also requests 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 parents of preschoolers with disabilities, the head start program disability coordinator disseminates and collects the surveys and sends 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, one 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 2020 high survey return rate of 98.89% (89/90) indicates that the responses represented the broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. The analysis will be conducted each year to determine improvements for reducing the potential nonresponse bias.

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

In FFY 2020, the total number of surveys disseminated was 90; of which, 14 surveys were from parents of preschoolers with an IEP and 76 surveys were from parents of school-age students with an IEP:

Preschool survey return rate = 100% (14/14)

School-Age survey return rate = 98.68% (75/76)

ROP reports that the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. All children with an IEP were accounted for in the dissemination of the parent survey. The return rate for preschoolers with an IEP was 100% (14/14); representative of all preschoolers with an IEP. For school-age students with an IEP, the return rate was 98.68% (75/76). One of the 76 surveys disseminated was not returned. ROP reviewed the ethnicity and school levels for determining representation.

Of the school-age survey respondents with valid responses, 71.62% (53/74) and 28.38% (21/74) of the parents have children in the elementary and high school respectively. As for the breakdown by ethnicity, 97.33% (73/75) of the respondents with valid responses identified themselves as being "Palauan" and 2.67% (2/75) identified themselves as being "Asian." The majority of the school-age respondents were from Koror state with 56% (42/75). The second largest group of respondents were from Airai with 20% (15/75).

With an exceptionally high return rate of 98.68% (75/76), the demographics of the school-age parent 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% was not used for this year's survey analysis. As reported earlier, ROP's response rate was 98.89% (89/90). A review of the potential nonresponse bias is discussed under the "analysis of the response rate" section of this indicator.

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

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

## 8 - Required Actions

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

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

Per OSEP's instructions, indicator 9 does not apply to ROP.

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 9 - Required Actions



## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

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

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 10 - Required Actions

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	67.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	94.44%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

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

### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
31	31	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.

Data Source: 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, 2020-June 30, 2021. This database was established specifically for tracking the timeline requirement for Indicator 11 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 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

#### 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 11 - OSEP Response

#### 11 - Required Actions

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

### 12 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 12 does not apply to ROP. ROP 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 =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority)}}{\text{(\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)}} \right] \times 100$ .

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	98.00%

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

### Targets

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

### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
18	18	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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, 2020-June 30, 2021. 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 2019**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

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

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

#### I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target ≥	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	50.00%
A	11.00%	Data	16.67%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	2009	Target ≥	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	60.00%	60.00%
B	56.00%	Data	33.33%	60.00%	60.00%	20.00%	11.11%
C	2009	Target ≥	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	100.00%	100.00%
C	100.00%	Data	83.33%	100.00%	70.00%	60.00%	66.67%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%	15.00%	20.00%	25.00%
Target B ≥	0.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	57.00%
Target C ≥	30.00%	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 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 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	3
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	3
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	0
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)	1
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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	0	3	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	0	3	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%	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)	1	3	66.67%	30.00%	33.33%	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	2019	2020
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

For FFY 2020, ROP reports 100% (3/3) response rate for Indicator 14, as with the previous year's response rate. ROP will continue to use its strategies for ensuring that ROP continues to report a 100% response rate, such as phone calls and in-person interviews.

**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.**

For FFY 2020, ROP reports 100% (3/3) response rate for Indicator 14, as with the previous year's response rate.

**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.**

For FFY 2020, ROP reports 100% (3/3) response rate for Indicator 14, as with the previous year's response rate. This 100% (3/3) response rate therefore represents the demographics of youth who no longer were 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).**

The metric of +/-3% to determine representativeness was not used for this year's survey respondents. ROP reported 100% (3/3) response rate for Indicator 14.

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

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

## 14 - Required Actions

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

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

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data					

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

Palau reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. Palau 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 (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

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

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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.

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					

Data					
------	--	--	--	--	--

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

#### 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 16 - OSEP Response

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

#### 16 - Required Actions

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

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

###### **A. Data Analysis**

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

###### **B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

#### C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

#### Additional Implementation Activities

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

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

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

Increase percentage of students with and without disabilities in grades 1-3 in the target school performing at the proficient level in the Post-PERA for reading comprehension.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

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

[http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP%20Theory%20of%20Action\\_508%20Compliant.pdf](http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP%20Theory%20of%20Action_508%20Compliant.pdf)

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

NO

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

The SSIP modifications will be to align SSIP activities to the Ministry of Education (MOE) infrastructure improvements: operating a year-round school schedule beginning school year 2022-2023, opening Kindergarten classes for five-year old children, and implementing an instructional coaching system.

### 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	2013	32.00%
B	2013	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%
Target B >=	0.00%	65.00%	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%

### FFY 2020 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 Post-PERA and Received a Valid Score	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	155	256		60.00%	60.55%	Met target	N/A



B	0	3		0.00%	0.00%	Met target	N/A
---	---	---	--	-------	-------	------------	-----

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Data source for the FFY 2020 data is the reading comprehension proficiency measurement based on the Palau English Reading Assessment (PERA) for grades 1-3 at Koror Elementary School (KES), the target school. The two target measures include:

A = All students in grades 1-3 at KES, the target school, who performed at the proficient level in the Post-PERA for reading comprehension in school year 2020-2021.

B = Students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at KES, the target school, who performed at the proficient level in the Post-PERA for reading comprehension in school year 2020-2021.

The FFY 2020 data for "A" includes all students in grades 1-3, inclusive of students with an IEP, who took the Post-PERA and received a valid score. There was a total of 256 students in grades 1-3 at the target school who took the Post-PERA and received a valid score. Of the total (denominator), 155 students in grades 1-3 scored proficient or advanced in the reading comprehension measure (numerator). Overall, the percentage is 60.55% (155/256) for ROP's FFY 2020 performance. By grades, the breakdown includes the following:

Grade 1 = 54.88% (45/82)

Grade 2 = 63.86% (53/83)

Grade 3 = 62.64% (57/91)

The FFY 2020 data for "B" includes students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at the target school who took the Post-PERA and received a valid score. There was a total of three students in grades 1-3 at the target school who took the Post-PERA and received a valid score. Of the total (denominator), "0" or none of the students with an IEP scored proficient or advanced in the reading comprehension measure (numerator). 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.

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

The MOE Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Materials Development (DCIMD) facilitates the administration of the PERA in all elementary schools. The teacher administers the PERA and submits the completed test sheets to DCIMD for review and input into the data file that is then transmitted to the Division of Research and Evaluation (DRE). The DRE analyzes the data and provides the SSIP Core Team the summary data related to the SiMR.

**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. The RSN was one of the resources utilized to develop the PERA. It is an interim assessment administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year.

**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.SSIEvaluationPlan\\_508%20Compliant.pdf](http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP.SSIEvaluationPlan_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 included the annual pre/post self-assessment of teacher knowledge and skills regarding the implementation of English reading instruction and intervention. This teacher assessment gauged the confidence in teachers regarding their knowledge and skills. Early literacy training and technical assistance, including data reviews, continued with a focus on how supports can be provided to ensure application of EBPs in the classroom. Revisions to existing MOE tools, in particular the Observation Tool, assisted MOE in determining their usefulness and sustainability as supports in other schools.

Pre/Post Self-Assessment: As in previous years, ROP continued implementing the teacher self-assessment survey, entitled "How do I feel?" (HDIF), to gather teacher perceptions of their knowledge and skills in reading instruction. Administered twice a year, the survey results supported the development and implementation of professional development activities.

MOE Training and Technical Assistance: As part of the MOE system of supports, MOE implemented professional development for all schools on EBP for literacy. To ensure application of literacy EBP learned from the training, classroom observations were conducted to support the teachers implement the EBP. In addition, 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 meet every Monday afternoon with scheduled times for vertical grade-level teams – grades 1-3 – to meet.

MOE Observation Tool: This tool was updated and implemented beginning school year 2020-2021. This revised tool consists of elements for the seven

teaching standards which cover more aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development, which will support evidence for teacher behavior changes. The SSIP target school observations were conducted before and after training activities related to early literacy elements and strategies.

**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. This school year, the coaching team will be working with one teacher. 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.

**CS #2: (Evaluation Plan CS #2):** In Phase II, ROP identified the Reading Success Network (RSN) as the SSIP universal screening tool. 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 student progress.

To ensure fidelity of administration, the RSN procedures include conducting a refresher training session on administration for teachers prior to each RSN administration and conducting observations of the administration. The RSN observation is conducted through the use of the "Screening Administration Observation Checklist" that reviews six areas of the screening process including materials, time, set up, administration, scoring, and accommodations for students with IEPs. This observation is done for each RSN administered.

**CS #3: (Evaluation Plan CS #3a, b, & c):** 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 comprehension 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 will continue in February 2022 to support the SSIP target school and scale-up school teachers 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.

MOE leadership has initiated discussions and framework to start Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023. Currently, there are a few elementary schools that offer Kindergarten for five-year old children in their respective communities, but this has been limited to those areas where the Head Start Program does not have a classroom. The SSIP Core Team discussed how 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.**

The Governance systems framework welcomed new MOE leadership in school year (SY) 2021-2022: the Minister of Education was appointed by the new ROP administration and the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction was hired. In addition, SY 2020-2021 included two new Chiefs for the Division of Instruction, Implementation and Teacher Training (DIITT) and DRE. These individuals are not new to Palau but are new to their leadership positions.

In SY 2021-2022, MOE partnered with REL-Pacific to facilitate leadership training focused on the development, implementation, and evaluation of 90-Day School Action Plans to prioritize school-specific improvement efforts. The SSIP target school principal incorporated the SSIP SIMR into their plan to focus on literacy improvement, which will have system implications on what and how school-level efforts are prioritized. In addition, special education facilitated a leadership series regarding the role of school administrators in implementing special education services. This virtual series led by Guam CEDDERS and a U.S. mainland consultant was designed for all school administrators.

The ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes have been identified for each Coherent Strategy (CS). CS #1, 2 and 3 include short-term outcomes that describe the anticipated increase in teacher knowledge, while the intermediate outcomes describe the anticipated changes in teacher behavior for implementing evidence-based practices (EBP). CS #1, 2, and 3 long-term outcomes describe the impact on student outcomes related to increased student proficiency in English reading. For CS #4, the focus has been on system improvement efforts between the two organizations, MOE and the Head Start Program.

**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 will support system change

and sustainability of improvement efforts as the SSIP moves from one school to two schools in SY 2022-2023. The current SSIP target school has supported the understanding of how the CS approaches and tools support improved early literacy outcomes. The current SSIP target school will be joined by another school whose school principal has been a member of the SSIP Core Team. The systems framework of data, PD, and TA will then extend to more than one school, which will provide additional information about how the SSIP efforts can impact the overall MOE system improvement efforts for increasing English literacy proficiency.

The CS #1 short-term outcomes target increased knowledge, skills, and attitudes for implementing EBP reading instruction. The CS #1 intermediate outcomes target increased implementation of EBP reading instruction. As outlined in the ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan, the use of the pre/post self-assessments and training evaluation and observation tools, 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. This year's observation data conducted from August 2021 to December 2021 however showed positive changes in teacher behaviors. 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. With technical support from NCEO, the RSN is considered an interim assessment administered three times a year for the purposes of measuring progress.

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 currently it is only administered by the one SSIP target school. Beginning SY 2022-2023, however, the scale-up school will join the SSIP target school in the administration and use of the RSN. Scaling up the use of the RSN will address the needed system supports for system implementation and sustainability. This includes improvements to the MOE data system for incorporating the RSN data and the PD and TA needed. The SSIP Core and School Teams also identified the need to address the manner in which the RSN is administered. The administration requires one-to-one which can be difficult, especially with a large class of at least 25 students. Also, in consultation with NCEO, the need for an alternate interim assessment for the RSN will be important to develop to ensure that all students, including students with significant cognitive disabilities, are accounted for in measuring what all students know and can do.

The use of the RSN will provide student-level information to identify areas of focus for instructional supports and interventions. 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, 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 comprehension 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. The Student Reading Profile standard operating procedures that incorporate the Focus of Concern (FOC) process have been developed. Feedback from the PLC sessions acknowledge the behavioral and academic needs of struggling learners. This acknowledgment also identified the need for additional training on identifying and implementing intensive intervention. As mentioned earlier, the MOE education specialists developed a training series that utilizes the NCII resources for data decision-making for identifying interventions. The training series started in January 2022 and will continue in February 2022.

CS #4: Systems framework = governance and TA. 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. A major infrastructure change is the potential for MOE to start Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning SY 2022-2023. The SSIP Core Team discussed how this change would need to be examined in relation to 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.

**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.**

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 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 as follows:

CS#1a: Activities include "How Do I Feel" (HDIF) self-assessment survey where teachers complete the survey twice a year to gauge their level of understanding of where they think they are from their personal and professional experiences. This data helps in developing training and support to enhance teaching skills on evidence-based practices in reading.

Next Steps: The pre/post self-assessment survey will continue to be used with the target and scale-up schools. Prior to the opening of school year 2022-2023, the survey will be completed by all grades 1-3 and special education at the scale-up school to assess perceptions of the teachers.

Anticipated Outcomes: The survey results will assist the SSIP Core Team determine the priorities for professional development and technical assistance to ensure that the perceived knowledge and skills of the teachers will result in increased evidence of application of EBP.

CS#1b: 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).

Next Steps: In addition to the continued use of the observations at the target school, support to the scale-up school will be provided to conduct observations. Support to include the principal from the target school providing technical assistance to the scale-up school principal.

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

CS#2: Screening Administration Observation Checklist is being collected to ensure the fidelity of each screening. During each observation, teachers showed great improvement in administering screening. Formal structure for observations indicates strong implementation from previous year, which could be attributed to the refresher sessions conducted.

Next Steps: Based on the year-round schedule for school year 2022-2023, dates for the three RSN administrations will be identified. In addition, the Kindergarten component of the RSN will be developed in anticipation of Kindergarten classes starting in school year 2022-2023. Training sessions will be scheduled for the scale-up school on the purpose and administration of the RSN, including how the fidelity of administration data will be collected.

Anticipated Outcomes: Implementation of the RSN by two schools in school year 2022-2023 will inform MOE about the system implications for incorporating the RSN as a system improvement effort. Currently, the RSN is limited to the SSIP activities.

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

Next Step: The training series on the NCII resources for identifying and providing intensive intervention for struggling learners, inclusive of students with disabilities will continue and include incorporating the progress monitoring data into the FOC process.

Anticipated Outcomes: Effective implementation of the student data review process will result in students increasing proficiency in reading.

CS#4: MOU between MOE & the Head Start Program in effect with a request by MOE to include data sharing. MOE leadership has initiated discussions and framework to start Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023.

Next Step: The potential of 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 and decrease the percentage of 1st grade repeaters.

#### **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 and scale-up school will inform MOE about the effectiveness of its processes and tools for improving student outcomes. In addition, the SSIP Core Team is comprised of key MOE leadership, including the Chiefs of the Division of Curriculum, Instruction, and Materials Development (DCIMD), the Division of Instruction, Implementation and Teacher Training (DIITT), and the Division of Research and Evaluation (DRE), as well as school principals from the four central elementary schools that make up the majority of the MOE student enrollment for elementary schools. The what, why, and how of the SSIP implementation designed and supported by key MOE leadership on the SSIP Core Team 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 school year 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.

To assess practice change, the SSIP target school observations were conducted before and after training activities 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 more 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. 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)

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. The frequency and process for conducting the observations could have contributed to the increased implementation levels. Within four months, teachers were observed four times. 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. In addition, MOE held the early literacy training in October 2021 followed by the consultant conducting a virtual observation in November 2021. Individual written feedback was provided to the teachers from the consultant.

#### **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. The RSN screener was one of the resources utilized to develop the PERA. In previous years, trend and cohort data have been reviewed by the SSIP Core Team to identify professional development and technical assistance needs for early literacy EBP, such as the intensive intervention training series using the NCII resources.

For school year 2021-2022, the RSN data revealed that the 1st grade performance in the first administration in August 2021 was significantly lower than the first administration in previous school years. The proficiency performance for the six Reading elements assessed ranged from 1% to 27% in August 2021 compared to the August 2020 results ranging from 1.25% to 51.5%. With school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic occurring in March 2020 through August 2020, the assumption would be that the August 2020 results would be lower than the August 2021. Members of the SSIP Core Team met with key Head Start Program coordinators to discuss possible changes in instruction during school year 2020-2021 that might have affected the performance of the incoming first graders in August 2021. During the meeting, Head Start Program coordinators shared that school year 2020-2021 still required COVID-19 preventive measures which required providing instruction and guidance with the preschoolers to follow the COVID-19 protocols. This change in the instructional routines might have affected how well the incoming 1st graders performed.

The 2nd and 3rd grade performance had some slight differences in the first administration in August 2021 compared to the previous year, but not as low as the 1st grade performance. The 2nd grade proficiency performance for the seven Reading elements assessed ranged from 8% to 100% in August 2021 compared to a range from 33.75% to 88.75% in August 2020. The 3rd graders performed at a range from 50% to 94% in August 2021 compared to a range from 62.75% to 98% in August 2020.

In the second administration in December 2021, all three grades increased their proficiency percentages: 1st grade ranged from 14% to 79%; 2nd grade ranged from 65% to 100%; and 3rd grade ranged from 59% to 95%.

The SSIP Core Team discussed that the increase in performance by the grades from August 2021 to December 2021 could be as a result of the MOE early literacy training and observations conducted in between the RSN administrations. The increased student performance reinforced what the

observations showed – increased implementation of EBP.

Since progress monitoring and instructional coaching are fairly new this school year, data and information regarding outcomes and fidelity of implementation will be reported next year.

**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 use of the RSN by the target school and scale-up school beginning school year 2022-2023.

**Next Steps:** Based on the year-round schedule for school year 2022-2023, dates for the three RSN administrations will be identified. In addition, the Kindergarten component of the RSN will be developed in anticipation of Kindergarten classes starting in school year 2022-2023. Training sessions will be scheduled for the scale-up school on the purpose and administration of the RSN, including how the fidelity of administration data will be collected.

**Anticipated Outcomes:** Implementation of the RSN by two schools in school year 2022-2023 will inform MOE about the system implications for incorporating the RSN as a system improvement effort. Currently, the RSN is limited to the SSIP activities.

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

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

**Next Steps:** Continuation of the training series related to the identification and implementation of intensive interventions for struggling learners.

**Anticipated Outcomes:** Incorporating the NCII into existing MOE resources and supports will increase the likelihood of sustaining the supports beyond SSIP.

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. 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.

**Next Steps:** In addition to the continued use of the observations at the target school, support to the scale-up school will be provided to conduct observations. Support to include the principal from the target school providing technical assistance to the scale-up school principal.

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

## **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 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.

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

In addition to the SSIP Core Team and School Team meetings that engage key MOE stakeholders in the review of the SSIP data and information for improving system supports, engagement of stakeholders included specific awareness and input sessions at the SSIP target school with parents and teachers:

**Parents:** From August 2021 to December 2021, four Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings were held. An average of over 56% of parents of students in grades 1-3 attended each meeting, which included parents of students with disabilities. The first meeting included two parents of students with disabilities, the second meeting had seven, third meeting included two, and the fourth meeting had three parents of students with disabilities in attendance. During the PTA meetings, the school principal shared updates on the progress of the SSIP activities, including grade-level results of the RSN administration. With the 90-Day School Action plan for the target school including the SSIP SIMR, it is anticipated that PTA meetings will continue

to include sharing of information on the SSIP activities to increase awareness and gather input on the early literacy focus and how parents can support their children increase their reading achievement.

Teachers: As discussed earlier, teachers engage in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to review student data, identify needed supports, and to share information about the implementation of EBP. Feedback from the PLC sessions included the challenges of supporting the behavioral and academic needs of struggling learners and the need for additional training on identifying and implementing intensive intervention. As mentioned earlier, the MOE education specialists developed a training series that utilizes the NCII resources for data decision-making for identifying interventions. The training series started in January 2022 and will continue in February 2022.

Teachers: On January 13, 2022, a stakeholder input session was held with grades 1-3 and special education teachers to gather feedback on the activities being implemented, the SIMR data for setting targets, and the RSN data for measuring progress. A particular review was on the participation of students with disabilities in the PERA and RSN. In addition, the teachers provided the following feedback on what's working and what's not working:

What's Working?

- RSN Assessment tells us where our kids are and level of learning to help with planning for instruction.

- Pairing students to help with projects or competitions.

- RSN screening helps us identify students that need interventions and develop lesson plans that differentiate instruction.

- Started providing specific and systematic phonics instruction: 1st quarter=short vowel sounds; 2nd quarter=long vowel sounds and differentiating long and short vowel sounds; 3rd quarter=long vowel sounds

- Able to focus on a specific skill based on the screening.

- FOC = Sitting down with parents and sharing with parents what the child is struggling with.

What's Not Working?

- Environment when administering the RSN Assessment – 1-to-1 administration in the classroom with the other students. Can be distracting for administration.

- Assigning homework is not working.

- Lack of an assistant to help with the classroom while administering the RSN assessment. Also, having 25 students makes the individual administration long which impacts instruction time. Because of the lack of an assistant, teacher has to go between administering the RSN then instruction then back to administering the RSN.

- Same issues with administration, especially during 1st quarter since students are becoming familiar with the routine. Having to copy worksheets (review of skills that they know) for the other students for each day.

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

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

A key stakeholder group for the SSIP is the teacher group. Ongoing feedback from the teachers assists the SSIP Core Team in prioritizing needed professional development and technical assistance. As discussed earlier, the concerns teachers raised were related to the one-to-one administration of the RSN and continued training on interventions.

The SSIP Core Team discussed how to support the concerns raised by the target school teachers. For the RSN administration support, the target school principals and scale-up school principals will meet to update the administration protocols and process for ensuring that teachers are supported during the RSN administration. For the training on interventions, as mentioned earlier, the MOE education specialists started the training series on Literacy Interventions using the NCII resources.

#### **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**

None

### **17 - OSEP Response**

Palau provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for Targets A and B in the Targets data table and OSEP accepts those targets.

Palau reported in its FFY 2020 submission that the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) had not changed from the previous submissions, however, Palau reported a single SiMR in the FFY 2020 submission and reported three SiMRs in previous submissions. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine the current SiMR for Palau.

### **17 - 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.

## **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:**

Nora Renguul

#### **Title:**

Special Education Coordinator

#### **Email:**

norarenguul@palaumoe.net

#### **Phone:**

680-488-2568

#### **Submitted on:**

04/28/22 11:06:04 PM