

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2023**

Palau



PART B DUE February 3, 2025

**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

Executive Summary

This report covers the Republic of Palau (ROP) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) covering the period FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 and the Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2023.

The introduction covers:

A description of ROP's General Supervision System, with emphasis on ROP's integrated monitoring activities. It also includes ROP's Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the FFY 2023 SPP and APR.

With input from parents and community partners ROP revised baselines as appropriate and identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2025. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, ROP reports FFY 2023 data to determine whether ROP met its targets, and if not explains slippage where applicable and respond to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2024 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter and ROP's FFY 2022 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 the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

Palau uses a cohort model to determine which schools to monitor. There are between 5 and 6 schools in each cohort. Onsite monitoring occurs on a three year cycle. However, during the previous monitoring year (22-23), the MOE decided to suspend onsite and offsite monitoring activities for the 23-24 school year due to significant IEP compliance concerns. To address the concerns, MOE provided intensive professional development and technical assistance to the schools before resuming the onsite and offsite monitoring activities in the 24-25 school year. In the 23-24 school year, Palau did monitor the indicators through their data system.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified compliance.

The Special Education monitoring team will review the Special Education Data System (SEDS) printout of cases (pending and active) of children with IEPs from the school to be monitored. From that list, the Special Education monitoring team will select a representative group of IEPs to be reviewed at the school. As much as possible, representation to include a distribution of grades, disabilities, assessment participation, and placement/LRE. The number of IEP files to be reviewed will be 50% plus 1 of the total number of children with IEPs in that school/program. If the total IEPs in the school is 10 or less, 100% of the IEP files will be reviewed. If noncompliance is identified, verification of timely correction will include a review of evidence provided for the correction of the individual student file/s AND a review of additional data (e.g., other student files) demonstrating 100% compliance, as stipulated in the Corrective Action Plan.

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

Monitoring: Monitoring data are collected through a variety of methods. The MOE collects monitoring data from schools through interviews with school staff and families, file reviews, examination of special education data from the SEDS database, and any formal or informal dispute resolution activity. These records are maintained onsite with the MOE. The SEA also uses an excel spreadsheet to collect and track findings of noncompliance. These data are reviewed on an ongoing basis until all individual and systemic corrections are verified.

SPP/APR: The MOE collects data from multiple sources. For indicators 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, and 13, Palau uses the Special Education Database (SEDS) to collect data from schools. This database also holds child count, and student exit data. The data for indicators 3 and 17 are collected from both schools, and the Division of Testing and Data Collection. Indicator 4 is collected by schools via a survey issued by the Division of Testing and Data Collection. It is housed in their database called Admin-Plus. The data is then shared with the MOE. For indicator 7, 8, and 14, Palau uses surveys and interviews of students, families, and educators. All the indicator data are collected over the reporting period and are reviewed once per year in December.

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

Palau issues findings by number of instances.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

The ROP-MOE ensures that noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from the identification of noncompliance. Within 90 calendar days of the monitoring activity (on-site), the Monitoring Team will complete a Monitoring Report, and if needed a Corrective Action Plan, which will be finalized by the Special Education Coordinator. The correction of noncompliance timeline begins on the date of the Written Notification of Findings when the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction informs a School Principal that the school is in noncompliance.

However, as described in Palau's Special Education General Supervision Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) Manual, a school is able to correct the noncompliance including correcting all child-specific noncompliance, and can demonstrate the correct implementation of the regulation through updated data prior to the MOE issuing the Written Notification of Findings.

If the school chooses to complete a prefinding correction, the principal will communicate their intent to conduct a prefinding correction within 30 days after completion of the monitoring visit. Once the corrections are complete, the Special Education Specialist then will verify correction of both child specific noncompliance and systemic implementation of the regulation through updated data.

Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

The ROP-MOE reserves the right to use any appropriate enforcement actions to correct deficiencies related to compliance with IDEA requirements. Deficiencies are defined as failure to correct findings of noncompliance identified by the ROP-MOE in the Written Notification of Findings based on the results of implementing the monitoring activity.

The Special Education Program will work closely with the school to correct the noncompliance, however, if the school does not correct the noncompliance within the specified timeline, with verified correction no later than one year of identification, the Republic of Palau Public Service System (PSS) Rules and Regulations shall serve as the basis for sanctions to be issued, in order as follows:

1. Conference held with the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction through the Minister of Education to School Principal, Teachers, Special Education Coordinator, and Special Education Specialists.
2. Conference will determine, in writing, required action with a specific timeline. If actions are not met within the specified timeline, Sanction #3 will be issued.
3. Written warning from the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction through the Minister of Education to the School addressed to the School Principal.
4. Take further adverse action, as required in the PSS Rules and Regulations.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

NA

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

Palau does not publish its General Supervision policies and procedures.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-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. Professional Training

The Special Education Core Team comprised of the Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialist (previously known as Consulting Resource Teachers - CRTs), Data Manager and related service providers, hold meetings as needed to discuss the status of all improvement activities and what can be done to support indicator cluster teams carry out specific SPP indicator activities, which include collaborating with the BCI content, assessment, and training specialists to implement training activities with parents, principals, teachers, and related service providers at different times of the year. All technical assistance and support to the schools are coordinated as a system.

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

The Special Education Program also provides parent workshops focused on parent rights, state complaints, parent roles and responsibilities in the special education process, and other topical areas. The parent workshops are conducted in collaboration with the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), ROP's organization for parents of children with disabilities, and school administrators to identify the workshop topical focus and scheduling.

The Special Education Program in partnership with the local CTE Program, Labor Office and WIOA are working together to make sure that students with disabilities have access to ACE career and technical education services, life skills and independent living training. For example, at our one public high school, there are CTE programs that offer these skills and other local agencies support these programs.

In addition, the Special Education Program accesses US National resources, such as OSEP-funded projects (National Center For Systemic Improvement and IDEA Center), 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.

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 for all teachers and implementation of specific MOE and school-level professional development training plans. Individual School Improvement Plans (SIP) are data driven improving student academic skills, which prioritize all professional development training needs are data driven from standard scores that come out every August 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 technical assistance, training, and support to school personnel, including special education teachers.

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 Ministry in partnership with other school districts in the US Mainland, OSEP, NSCI and local partners has focused on improving systems based on schools' formal and informal assessments and overall assessment of all programming with students with disabilities from start to finish. For example, we have new members that are serving in the interagency to ensure that child find system for Palau Special Ed Program is clear, there is one form for all interagency to eliminate delay of services, special education teachers caseload at the school level has improved to include head start students from their feeder elementary school to set early relationship with students and families for clean flow of students into the elementary school and track students with disabilities and services.

With OSEP's Results-Driven Accountability focus, via the SSIP, The Ministry implemented instructional coaching that is embedded in the classroom to provide support for both teachers in the classroom tier 1 and special education teachers to be able to track all student IEP goals and progress to ensure that students are meeting their goals and have continuous support. This includes both special education teachers and general education teachers working in teams and planning together and utilizing professional learning communities (PLC) within their building time and collaborating with peers during inservice training to keep track of student progress and being responsive to their needs. They learn from each other and immediately make modifications in response to student needs and much needed interventions.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from 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 parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

8

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.

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) met in October of 2024 to review ROP's APR performance data and trend data for each Indicator, to provide input on target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR.

In response to improving student results on the statewide assessment. SEAC met with MOE leadership and a new and improved statewide (IOWA) assessments protocol for all students with disabilities has been implemented. In an effort to improve the participation rate of students with disabilities in the statewide assessments, indicator 3A, in the October meeting stakeholders were presented longitudinal data and were invited to discuss, offer insights on a root cause for the low participation rate, and proposed strategies for improvement. The ROP has followed through with their recommendations and is working on strategies, together with the assessment office, to improve the participation rate of students with disabilities in the upcoming statewide assessment in March/April.

SEAC has been meeting with MOE leadership to get updates on program services, changes with staffing and new offices which has now consolidated to improve student services.

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.

The following activities are conducted annually and throughout the school year to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. The family and community partners are part of the conversation to understand the goals and direction of the Palau Special Education Program including non-compliance issues as we continue to work collaboratively together to gather input from all sides to address these concerns together to meet IDEA compliance. It is through this collaboration that we have an opportunity to teach our family and community partners the different indicator requirements and to be able to gain their feedback and continued support to develop and implement program activities to have successful outcomes for children with disabilities. This is a working progress for Palau Special Education Program and we are moving forward to putting these activities in our annual master school calendar to continue to promote activities to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

International Day for Persons with Disabilities Committee is a working group of different agencies, (Private sector, Non-Government Organizations, Faith-Based Organizations, and Government Agencies) that collaborate to better provide services to persons with disabilities. As a member, and through the collaborative effort with these partners our goal is to ensure best practices, awareness, outreach, and services are provided to the community. It has provided the MOE an opportunity to be part of the team in designing and participating in activities of the International Day of Persons with Disabilities.

The 2024 International Day of Persons with Disabilities (IDPD) was a significant occasion to celebrate and promote inclusivity and equity. This was also an opportunity to educate the community of the challenges faced by persons with disabilities and their families, and to advocate for their rights. This event outlined a comprehensive planning that resulted in a memorable and impactful IDPD celebration.

Palau Parent Empowerment and Omekeasang are organizations that represent parents of children with disabilities and individuals with disabilities. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

Omekeasang is an advocacy group for individuals with disabilities. Special Education program coordinator and staff participated in various activities planned throughout the week.

The Special Education Acting Coordinator participated in a monthly joint meeting with all other chiefs of the government to discuss special education programs and services to increase awareness of services and opportunities available for children and youth with disabilities.

The Director of Curriculum & Instruction who oversees the Special Ed Program in Palau has attended many different events with the Ministry of Health as one of the Panelists to increase awareness and services in Special Education.

Both the Director of Curriculum and Instruction and Acting Coordinator sit on the interagency with the Ministry of Health and Palau Community Agency and meet once a month to discuss new referrals and support intake and smooth referrals into Special Education services and to ensure that partners are aware of all Special Education protocol.

The Palau Interagency Team is a group working to serve people with special needs. The Interagency team is made up of representatives from Public Health Family Unit, Head Start Center Coordinators and Disability Coordinator, and the Palau Parent Empowerment Group. Through collaboration with the team Palau Ministry of Education/Special Education Program changed the referral process to be centralized and monitored between the Public Health, Head Start Program, Special Education Program centralized the referral process began in the last reporting period (FFY 2022) and is in effect now. This process has harness parents trust and understanding with services provided to their children and provides direct communication with early childhood special education teachers, Head Start teachers, public health personnel and the Public Health Family Unit. This approach is conducive with our small and diverse community. Special Education Teachers were also assigned to Head Start Centers and Private Kindergarten near the elementary school. Example: Special Education is integrated at a school serving kindergarten, first grade and Head Start and or private kindergarten students near that school. Before this centralized process- there was one consulting resource room teacher overseeing all the early childhood referrals and two teachers. . /Special Education Head Start Location.docx

The Special Education Advisory Council has been meeting with Ministry of Education leadership to get updates on program services, changes with staffing and new offices which has now consolidated to improve student services.

An instructional Coaching Consultant was hired to work with teachers following the school schedule to provide ongoing support in the classroom, IEP writing and smooth referrals into special education program.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

In response to the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) meeting in October 2024, on improving student results on the statewide assessment, a strategies to improve the participation of students with disabilities in the statewide assessments were discussed. Additionally, training for test proctors and overall assessment supervision and housekeeping has been ongoing to prepare for upcoming statewide assessment in March/April.

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 the Advisory Council (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://www.palauschools.org/?p=se>

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2022 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 2022 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2022 APR in 2024, 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 of 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://www.palauschools.org/?p=se>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The ROP's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In ROP's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised ROP of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required ROP to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed ROP to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. ROP must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which ROP received assistance; and (2) the actions ROP took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

(1) Technical assistance sources ROP received assistance;

As advised by the Department, ROP utilized the OSEP-funded technical assistance centers for support to improve student results. ROP continues to receive technical assistance from NCSI through monthly Pacific Entities TA calls focusing on state systemic improvement plans and ROP specific TA support in preparation for OSEP monitoring since ROP was assigned to Cohort 3. IDC is currently providing technical assistance through a Virtual training for a special ed. staff who will take on the responsibility of a data manager on Part B 618 data requirements and submission. The ROP also has several contracts with vendors assisting and building capacity of ROP staff in various areas of need, such as EdHannah and WestEd.

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

ROP is receiving weekly TA from NCSI on the preparation for OSEP's DMS Cohort 3 review. This TA involves a review of the ROP General Supervision System. The ROP has revised materials as appropriate. With respect to the SPP/APR, ROP has received TA to improve schools' performance in all indicators, compliance and results indicators.

EdHannah Education Consultancy Services supports MOE in ensuring service providers, including both general education and special education teachers, are equipped to deliver high-quality services for children with disabilities. EdHannah focuses on enhancing academic results, addressing diverse student needs, and ensuring compliance with state and federal standards through data-driven practices, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), evidence-based interventions, and collaboration.

Through a combination of onsite and offsite monitoring, data-driven practices, ongoing professional development, and structured collaboration, EdHannah Education Consultancy Services provides the tools and knowledge that teachers need to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. These services foster a culture of continuous improvement, collaboration, and accountability, ensuring that both students and special education teachers achieve success in meeting educational goals as stay compliant with the provisions of IDEA.

WestEd has provided consulting services to the ROP team. WestEd support includes support for updating policies and procedures, support for dispute resolution, designing and implementing community engagement activities, and support with data analysis.

Intro - OSEP Response

Palau's determinations for both 2023 and 2024 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 21, 2024 determination letter informed Palau that it must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which Palau received assistance; and (2) the actions Palau took as a result of that technical assistance. Palau provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

Palau's IDEA Part B determination for both 2024 and 2025 is Needs Assistance. In Palau's 2025 determination letter, the Department advised Palau of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required Palau to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed Palau 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. Palau must report, with its FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2026, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions Palau 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 ED^{Facts} 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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	70.10%	70.10%	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%
Data	16.67%	20.00%	33.33%	75.00%	28.57%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	2
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
1	4	28.57%	50.00%	25.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In the previous APR (SY2021-2022), two out of seven students (28.57%) exited with a high school diploma. In the present year, using data from SY 2022-23, one student out of four (25%) exited with a high school diploma. The group of exiting students is 55% fewer than last year. Proportionally, we can say, with such small number of students, the data is similar, and the slippage is not a result of a system's issue. Furthermore, this year we had an increase on the number of students exiting with a certificate of completion and a reduction on the number of students who dropped out, representing improvement on the exiting profile for the ROP students, outside of graduation with a regular diploma.

Graduation Conditions

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	33.33%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	33.33%	30.00%	30.00%
Data	18.18%	22.22%	33.33%	0.00%	71.43%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	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 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	2
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
1	4	71.43%	30.00%	25.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

ROP drop-out procedures, such as attendance and withdrawal requirements, are the same for students without disabilities and students with disabilities. ROP drop-out definition is consistent with the IDEA 618 drop-out definition: Dropout students are students who were enrolled at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period and did not exit special education through any of the other means.

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts 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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	85.00%	90.00%	94.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community

partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1	12	12
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	0	9	10
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	0	2	2

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1	12	12
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	0	8	10
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	0	2	2

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) 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.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	1	76.92%	80.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	11	12	75.00%	85.00%	91.67%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	12	12	94.44%	85.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

There was only one student with an IEP in the 4th grade across all schools in Palau. This student was slated to take the Alternate Assessment. The student was not available during the testing window. The MOE is working with the Testing Office to extend the testing window and to offer more opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in make up tests in school year 2024-2025.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	1	84.62%	80.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	10	12	75.00%	85.00%	83.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	12	12	88.89%	85.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

There was only one student with an IEP in the 4th grade across all schools in Palau. This student was slated to take the Alternate Assessment. The student was not available during the testing window. The MOE is working with the Testing Office to extend the testing window and to offer more opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in make up tests in school year 2024-2025.

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 MOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. ROP provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR, which is posted on the MOE website under Special Education Performance Reports: <http://www.palauschools.org/?p=se>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)
3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response
3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	40.00%	50.00%	60.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of

In addition to our parents and community parents , the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist , special ed teachers and special ed specialist . The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	0	9	10
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	1	1

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	0	8	10
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	1	2

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Gr o u p	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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	0	37.50%	30.00%		N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	1	9	25.00%	30.00%	11.11%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1	10	13.33%	30.00%	10.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	0	62.50%	40.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1	8	25.00%	30.00%	12.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	2	10	66.67%	50.00%	20.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

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 MOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. ROP provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR, which is posted on the MOE website under Special Education Performance Reports: <http://www.palauschools.org/?p=se>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In October 2024, after reviewing the performance of students with disabilities in the Statewide Assessments, the Palau PSS Special Education Office invited the Testing and Data Collection Office (TDC, assessment office), SEAC, and Principals and Teachers for a meeting. During this meeting a facilitator engaged the participants in a discussion regarding the assessment results and potential results for the lower performance of students with disabilities. Based on the root cause analysis, participants offered strategies for improvement. As a result of this meeting, the Palau PSS designed the following strategies that are currently being implemented: 1) Community awareness campaign for parents about the importance of students with disabilities participating in the statewide assessment; 2) Agreement with the TDC to increase the testing window for students with disabilities who require accommodations to up to 10 days; 3) In the Principals Forum, the PSS team shared Palau's accommodations, and accommodations planning, a Medical Exemption form, and a Letter for Parents. In addition to these items, Palau PSS continue to implement the Special Education Assessment Transit Form and the Statewide Accommodations Monitoring Form (for individual students).

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that Palau reported, "During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented." OSEP may follow up with Palau, outside of the SPP/APR process, regarding how it has ensured that test administrations adhere to the IDEA requirements.

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 EDEFACTS 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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October

10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	0	2	2
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	1	2

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

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	0	2	2
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	0	1	2

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	0	100.00%	30.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1	2	0.00%	30.00%	50.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2	2	50.00%	30.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	0	0	66.67%	30.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1	2	0.00%	30.00%	50.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2	2	100.00%	30.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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 2023-2024 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	28.00	26.00	20.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	35.00	30.00	25.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	35.00	30.00	25.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	10.00	10.00	0.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	15.00	15.00	10.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/08/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	158	196	362
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	0	9	10
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	65	105	211
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	1	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	1	1

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/08/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	158	197	360
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	0	8	10
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	36	85	234
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	1	2
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	1	2

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4		41.14%	-2.35	28.00		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	11.11%	54.08%	20.26	35.00	42.97	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	10.00%	58.56%	35.74	35.00	48.56	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4		22.78%	-40.22	10.00		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	12.50%	43.65%	25.00	15.00	31.15	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	20.00%	65.56%	-3.40	9.00	45.56	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In October 2024, after reviewing the performance of students with disabilities in the Statewide Assessments, the Palau PSS Special Education Office invited the Testing and Data Collection Office (TDC, assessment office), SEAC, and Principals and Teachers for a meeting. During this meeting a facilitator engaged the participants in a discussion regarding the assessment results and potential results for the lower performance of students with disabilities. Based on the root cause analysis, participants offered strategies for improvement. As a result of this meeting, the Palau PSS designed the following strategies that are currently being implemented: 1) Community awareness campaign for parents about the importance of students with disabilities participating in the statewide assessment; 2) Agreement with the TDC to increase the testing window for students with disabilities who require accommodations to up to 10 days; 3) In the Principals Forum, the PSS team shared Palau's accommodations, and accommodations planning, a Medical Exemption form, and a Letter for Parents. In addition to these items, Palau PSS continue to implement the Special Education Assessment Transit Form and the Statewide Accommodations Monitoring Form (for individual students).

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that Palau reported, "During the SY 2023-2024, the Testing Office implemented a new standardized method for delivering the assessment to students, reducing the testing window time to three days for all schools. Because of the lack of proctors to implement the tests in three days to all students, some accommodations to students with disabilities were not properly implemented." OSEP may follow up with Palau, outside of the SPP/APR process, regarding how it has ensured that test administrations adhere to the IDEA requirements.

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 must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 23-01, dated July.

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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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": ROP defines significant discrepancy as a relative difference that exceeds .5.

This is calculated as follows:

(a) % of suspensions and expulsions > 10 days for students with disabilities equals # of students with disabilities suspended/expelled greater than 10 days divided by # of students with disabilities enrolled in school year.

(b) % of suspensions and expulsions > 10 days for students without disabilities equals # of students without disabilities suspended/expelled greater than 10 days divided by # of students without disabilities enrolled in school year.

The difference in the rates of suspension and expulsions between (a) and (b) equals (a) – (b). The relative difference in the rates of suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days equals (a) – (b) / (b).

Data reflected for FFY 2023 reflect the one-year data lag requirement with the relative difference calculated as follows using data from 2022-2023:

Out of School Suspensions (OSS) SWD 3-21 who were suspended 0 / 89 (students with disabilities ages 3-21) = 0%

OSS Students without Disabilities ages 3-21 who were suspended 27 / enrollment 2,467 3-21 (Students without disabilities (SY 22-23) = 1.09%

No significant discrepancy was identified in Palau in SY2022-2023 (FFY 2023)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 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 the case when significant discrepancy is identified, the ROP will review and revise their policies (if ROP or a school has noncompliance), procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards as outlined in 34 CFR 300.170 (b).

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 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 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, 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.

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 23-01, dated July.

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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 instruction, Indicator 4B does not apply to ROP.

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable to Palau.

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 ED*Facts* 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2019	Target >=	62.00%		54.00%	54.00%	54.00%
A	57.14%	Data	60.00%	57.14%	54.22%	47.37%	41.76%
B	2019	Target <=	11.00%		14.00%	13.00%	13.00%
B	14.29%	Data	13.75%	14.29%	13.25%	13.68%	20.88%
C	2019	Target <=	2.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
C	0.00%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Target B <=	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%
Target C <=	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from 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 parents and community partners. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of

In addition to our parents and community parents , the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist , special ed teachers and special ed specialist . The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	87
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	34
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	34	87	41.76%	60.00%	39.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16	87	20.88%	11.00%	18.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	87	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>Palau is working to improve the number of students who receive services in the general education setting (80% or more of the time in the day in the general regular class). However, this is an IEP decision.</p> <p>The slippage represents a reduction from 38/91 students in SY 2022-2023 to 34/87 in SY 2023-2024. That means four less students received services in the regular setting this year. The small numbers of students reported result in data volatility, which means minor shifts in student populations can have more notable impacts on statewide data.</p> <p>The Palau team does not believe there was any specific or system issue that can explain this slippage. And Palau is working to improve IEP development and implementation so all students receive services in their specific least restriction environment.</p>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	Target >=	100.00%		85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
A	Data	0.00%	83.33%	100.00%	100.00%	75.00%
B	Target <=	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
C	Target <=				0.00%	
C	Data			0.00%	0.00%	25.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of

In addition to our parents and community parents , the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist , special ed teachers and special ed specialist . The SSIP School Team are 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 baselines 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	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=			

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/31/2024

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	0	1	3	4
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	0	1	3	4
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility				
c1. 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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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	4	4	75.00%	90.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility	0	4	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	0	4	25.00%		0.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Per Indicator 6 instructions, ROP is not required to establish baseline or set targets for 6C until they report 10 or more preschoolers receiving home services.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

Palau reported fewer than ten children receiving special education and related services in the home in FFY 2023. 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 3 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A1	2008	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%
A1	100.00%	Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

A2	2008	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	20.00%	50.00%
A2	100.00%	Data	0.00%		0.00%	30.00%	50.00%
B1	2008	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%
B1	100.00%	Data	100.00%		100.00%	80.00%	100.00%
B2	2008	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	20.00%	50.00%
B2	100.00%	Data	0.00%		0.00%	30.00%	50.00%
C1	2008	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%
C1	100.00%	Data	100.00%		100.00%	90.00%	100.00%
C2	2008	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	20.00%	50.00%
C2	100.00%	Data	0.00%		0.00%	30.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Target A2 >=	60.00%	75.00%	100.00%
Target B1 >=	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Target B2 >=	60.00%	75.00%	100.00%
Target C1 >=	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
Target C2 >=	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1

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%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1	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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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>	1	1	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	0	1	50.00%	60.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	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	1	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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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>	1	1	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	0	1	50.00%	60.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)							

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	1	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 C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	1	1	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	0	1	100.00%	60.00%	0.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	It's not applicable because in Palau only 1 student exited the pre-school system and that student improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.
B2	It's not applicable because in Palau only 1 student exited the pre-school system and that student improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.
C2	It's not applicable because in Palau only 1 student exited the pre-school system and that student improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.

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 (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

The ROP Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Preschool Outcome Measurement System Procedural Manual is used to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices for gathering child outcome data for the three outcome measures. The ECSE and Head Start Program staff reviewed the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) measurement system procedures and the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) forms, which include the "bucket list" concept that provides a description of a child's functioning compared to age-appropriate skills.

Multiple sources of information are used in determining a child's status relating to the three preschool outcomes. The summary information for child outcomes is expected to take into account the child's functioning across a full range of situations and settings. Therefore, information from individuals in

contact with the child is considered in deciding on outcomes. Multiple sources include but are not limited to: Parent input/observation, service provider/s observation, assessment/evaluation results, and child progress reports from service providers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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 must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	YES
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	YES

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Preschool	2005	Target >=	93.00%	93.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Preschool	88.00%	Data	71.43%	100.00%	92.86%	92.31%	100.00%
School age	2013	Target >=	99.00%	99.00%	97.00%	95.00%	95.00%
School age	97.47%	Data	98.65%	94.74%	97.33%	96.20%	98.78%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	90.00%	92.00%	92.00%
Target B >=	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	2	2	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
School age	64	65	98.78%	97.00%	98.46%	Met target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

81

Percentage of respondent parents

82.72%

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	97.73%	82.72%

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

The metric of +/-3% discrepancy calculation was used for this year's survey analysis. ROP's overall response rate was 82.72% (67/81), a high return rate.

Include the State's analyses of 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.

In FFY 2023, the total number of surveys disseminated was 81; of which, 4 surveys were sent to parents of preschoolers with an IEP and 77 surveys were sent to parents of school-age students with an IEP:

Preschool survey return rate = 50.00% (2/4)

School-Age survey return rate = 84.41% (65/77)

ROP utilized the Non-Response Bias Analysis Application (NRBA App) to analyze representativeness of the respondents with respect to the demographics of the target population (children receiving special education services in Palau in SY 2023-2024). ROP analyzed representativeness with respect to two demographic groups (race/ethnicity and disability categories). With respect to race/ethnicity, the respondents are representative of the target group. With respect to disability categories, the NRBA App analysis indicated the disability category "Other Health Impairment" (OHI) was underrepresented in the group of respondents.

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

NO

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

Usually the ROP collects the parent surveys before the end of the school year and collects surveys from virtually all parents of the students with disabilities in Palau schools in a given school year. In SY 2023-2024 the ROP had a late start on the collection of the survey, the letters did not go out to schools until the end of March and the month of April. Therefore the ROP staff had less time to follow up with school staff on missing surveys. For SY 2024-2025 the ROP has set up a timeline for the survey distribution and data collection process, starting in February and completing the process by March, with possible follow up with schools in April. The ROP follow up with schools will emphasize the data collection from parents of the group that was underrepresented in the SY 2023-2024 (OHI).

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

ROP is a small entity, with less than 100 students with disabilities in a given year. We believe the strategy described above for SY 2024-2025 will improve the response rate as compared to what ROP obtained in SY 2023-2024.

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

The ROP utilized the NRBA App tool to analyze the response rate and the non-response bias. 100% of the respondents (parents) from the underrepresented group (OHI) reported that schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children with disabilities. Therefore, based on the NRBA App, if more parents of students with OHI responded to the survey, the percent of parents responding positively to the Indicator 8 question would increase (higher than 98.46%). This would impact positively on the progress of this indicator, and would not impact progress or slippage and ROP still would be meeting the target for this indicator in FFY 2023.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. 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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

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

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 instruction, indicator 9 does not apply to ROP.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable to Palau.

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 section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). 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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 instruction, indicator 10 does not apply to ROP.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable to Palau.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	67.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
15	15	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The evaluation data was taken from the database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024. 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 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 instruction, Indicator 12 does not apply to ROP. ROP does not receive IDEA Part C funds.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable to Palau.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	98.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	93.33%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
22	22	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, 2023-June 30, 2024. 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 2022

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2024 on students who left school during 2022-2023, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2022-2023 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).

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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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 analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2009	Target ≥	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	10.00%	10.00%
A	11.00%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%
B	2009	Target ≥	60.00%	60.00%	0.00%	10.00%	20.00%
B	56.00%	Data	20.00%	11.11%	0.00%	75.00%	33.33%
C	2009	Target ≥	100.00%	100.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
C	100.00%	Data	60.00%	66.67%	33.33%	75.00%	33.33%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	15.00%	20.00%	25.00%
Target B ≥	30.00%	40.00%	57.00%
Target C ≥	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners’ input. ROP’s Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents, the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist, special ed teachers and special ed specialist. The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2	4	0.00%	15.00%	50.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3	4	33.33%	30.00%	75.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	3	4	33.33%	60.00%	75.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2022	2023
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

All leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, as in the previous year. However, in case we were not able to collect data from all exiters, ROP would use the -3/+3 discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The FFY 2023 Indicator 14 actual data of leavers are the 618 exiters from 2022-2023. There were four exiters in 2022-2023: One student graduated with a HS diploma, two students received a Certificate, one student dropped out. There are two students attending Palau Community College (one had originally received a certificate but is attending classes at the community college towards an associate degree in agriculture, and the one who received a diploma, is enrolled in academic classes). The student who dropped out is competitively employed. One of the students who received the certificate is staying at home. All leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey, as in the previous reporting year. The response data therefore are representative of the demographics of youth who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

YES

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (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 baselines 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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/13/2024	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents , the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist , special ed teachers and special ed specialist . The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target >=			

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

Palau reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2023. 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)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baselines or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of 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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	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 parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents , the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist , special ed teachers and special ed specialist . The SSIP School Team are target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=					
Data					

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

Palau reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2023. 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) (SiMR) 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 2022 through February 2027, 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) 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 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2024). 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 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

Increased percentage of students Reading Comprehension grade 1-3 with disabilities in Palau schools at the proficient level in ROP's state-wide assessment.

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

YES

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

The change was a result of ROP scaling up the SSIP implementation, moving from one target school to all elementary schools.

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

When the ROP had only target school included in the SSIP implementation there were very few students (less than 10) included in the SiMR. Including all Palau schools will provide more reliable data to measure SiMR progress.

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

Palau has been providing literacy training to all schools for the last two years. It included coaching of teachers in all schools, across several literacy programs being implemented in all schools. The Palau team assessed the other schools' (Non-SiMR schools) readiness to be included in the SiMR. Data points, such as student progress monitoring data from I-ready, the capacity of schools' staff to continue the implementation of these programs, and the Palau team's capacity to provide supports and resources needed in all schools were used to make the decision to scale up the SiMR. This decision was supported by SEAC, Principals and teachers during a SSIP stakeholder meeting.

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

On October 10, 2024 stakeholders participated in a conversation regarding the implementation of the SSIP. Stakeholders were presented with the option of scaling up the SSIP implementation by moving from one target school to including all Palau schools in the SSIP. The stakeholders unanimously welcomed the change.

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

NO

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

YES

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

The only change was related to language moving from one target school to all Palau schools as part of the outcome of the SSIP.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<http://www.palauschools.org/?p=se>

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	18.18%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2023	2024	2025
-----	----------------------	------	------	------

Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	18.18%	19.00%	20.00%
--------	--	--------	--------	--------

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Grades 1-3 students on all Schools Scoring Proficient or Above	Grades 1-3 students at all schools Who Took the State-Wide Assessment and Received a Valid Score	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
2	11		18.18%	18.18%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 data.

ROP's state-wide assessments (IOWA and the portfolio system for the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS)).

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

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

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

As displayed in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR data tables, the two target measures were of grades 1-3 at Palau elementary schools.

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

The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Division of School Testing and Data Collection facilitates the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the IOWA assessments in all schools. During assessment the school principal supervises the administration of the assessment while teachers administer the test to their students and an assigned Ministry of Education staff is present as the test monitor. The assessment is administered in 2-3 days. Test times vary from 30 minutes to 45 minutes, additional time is given in increments of 10 minutes. Other accommodations are also provided based on student IEPs.

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

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

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, which 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://www.palauschools.org/?p=se>

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:

MOE Training and Technical Assistance: As part of the MOE system of support, MOE implemented professional development for the target school on the use of data and identifying appropriate reading interventions. In addition, multiple IEP training was implemented (CS #3b). All schools implemented the Professional Learning Community (PLC) framework for grade-level and vertical grade-level teams to meet and discuss student data and instructional support needs.

The Ministry of Education (MOE) has implemented comprehensive infrastructure improvement strategies to enhance the educational environment of identified target schools, with a specific focus on meeting the unique needs of students in special education. The strategy encompasses physical, technological, and supportive resource improvements to create an inclusive and accessible learning environment.

In order to ensure that schools' physical infrastructure is fully inclusive and accessible to students with diverse needs, the team conducted accessibility audits to identify areas that require improvement. Classrooms were moved, rearranged and renovated to accommodate the needs of the students and adhere to the tenets of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Sensory-friendly designed elements were added to resource rooms. Furthermore, to ensure appropriate technology integration, MOE procured additional tablets and smart boards to provide students who need assistive technology with a 1:1 device.

To create learning spaces that cater to different learning styles and accommodate mobility aids, MOE has invested in flexible classroom furniture which will be constructed by our very own CTE carpentry program at the high school and equipped classrooms with assistive tools and resources for teachers and students. To foster collaborative spaces, MOE is in the process of recreating and renovating a common space where teachers could collaborate including parents and community partners.

To enhance connection with families and improve operational efficiency, MOE has shifted its focus to strengthen engagement and parent partnerships. Parents were invited to have dedicated office space within the SPED offices, fostering a more welcoming and collaborative environment. In response to the unique challenges faced by Palau schools without a pool of substitute teachers, SPED staff is actively learning to share the workload and cover for each other. This collaborative effort ensures continuous support for our students, even in the absence of a formal system to request for substitute teachers.

The title of special education aides was changed to "Para Professionals" to maintain consistency with the SPED program's title and CRT formerly known as consultant resource teachers has been changed to special ed specialist to maintain clarity with parents and community partners and consistent to all content specialists at the department.

This change was made to maintain clarity and coherence across all aspects of special education and support /services. Moreover, the Special Education Procedural Manual is currently undergoing a comprehensive update to ensure that it reflects the latest best practices and guidelines in special education. This initiative aims to provide the staff with a reliable and up-to-date resource.

To enhance communication and accessibility, the SPED website was redesigned. This redesign focuses on providing valuable information and resources to parents, students, and the community. Additionally, MOE is actively searching for special education program software that will enable the team to keep track of student information more efficiently while the rigorous work for a data system for the program has begun on the ground in the last few months. The hope is that once a software is identified and procured, we can simply import all data into the new software and immediately activate the system. This new system will contribute to streamlined processes and improved data management within the SPED program.

School facilities, such as bathrooms, are being renovated to cater to the needs of physically challenged students. Most of our buildings date back to the 60's and lack access for our students with disabilities to move about on campus. With that, the special education office in partnership with school operation and a group of government public work architects including the Ministry of Health are scheduled to do an access audit to all school facilities to support our students with disabilities as we make plans to do small renovations.

This ensures that physical infrastructure aligns with the highest standards of safety and accessibility for our students. To continuously assess the effectiveness of the infrastructure improvements and make necessary adjustments, MOE has implemented a continuous improvement plan with regular assessments. Feedback from students, teachers, parents, and staff is regularly collected.

Instructional Coaching:

The MOE contracted a licensed Special Education Instructional Coach to assist in developing and providing quality teacher training in IEP development, laws, and processes, student assessments, data collection, curriculum interventions, and strategies. The rationale behind this is to address the various needs of students with disabilities in Palau schools by

- Using the instructional coaching cycle, an embedded professional development in the classroom that begins with planning, co-teaching /facilitating in the classroom and being able to provide reflections and feedback to teachers to build not only teacher capacity and confidence in their teaching but to foster and model positive teaching relationships in the classroom.
- Providing professional development trainings on writing meaningful and legally defensible IEPs
- Supporting teachers and support staff in identifying, developing, and implementing curriculum, assessment, and instructional strategies designed to improve the learning of students with disabilities
- Working with classroom teachers in planning for students learning outcomes based on assessed needs of individuals and the use of data and information to determine each student's current knowledge and skill level, support student learning goals, and assess student progress. The assessment of student needs includes the use of district approved assessment tools and strategies in addition to the teachers own professional practice.
- Working collaboratively in a professional learning community with other teachers, support staff, and others as appropriate, in addressing the needs of students and implementing effective teaching and learning practices. Through collaboration, the Special Education Instructional Coach provides appropriate consultation and interventions for students who are at risk and facilitates the identification of students for special education when appropriate.
- Working with teachers and staff in using research-based instructional and learning strategies and content specific, differentiated instruction including assisting teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing lessons. This includes providing consultation to school staff working with students with disabilities in the following areas: instruction, assessment, curriculum, communication, behavior, organization, use of visual systems, self-management, sensory needs, social skills and the design of the physical environment in the classroom

Beginning the school year 2022-2023 and continuing in SY 2023-2024, MOE opened the school year with Kindergartners in all MOE elementary schools. Currently, the SSIP target school has one Kindergarten class. This change is being 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.

Beginning school year 2022-2023, and continuing in SY 2023-2024, system changes include implementing:

- A year-round school schedule. The academic year begins in July with the school year divided into four quarters with a short intercession between each quarter.
- Kindergarten in all elementary schools.
- Increased reading/language arts instructional time to 90 minutes each school day.
- Targeted training in areas for improvement based on student data implemented in smaller groups or school-specific sessions.

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

CS #1: Systems framework = data, professional development (PD), technical assistance (TA). The annual pre/post self-assessment tool was developed specifically for the SSIP activities. This tool has been incorporated into MOE training activities. The use of existing MOE tools support system changes and sustainability of improvement efforts.

The systems framework of data, PD, and TA provide targeted support in all schools.

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

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

CS #2: Systems framework = Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intermittent Assessment has been implemented to inform lesson planning, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed. The MOE Intermittent assessments are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment.

CS #2 addresses the systems framework related to data, quality standards, PD, and TA. The MOE Intermittent Assessment being administered in all schools, reviewing the use of both assessment tools at the target school will assist in determining if these assessments are duplicative or complementary.

The MOE Intermittent Assessment is designed to inform instruction. CS #2 short-term and intermediate outcomes target increased knowledge and skills on the administration of the interim assessment and the ability to administer the interim assessment. With fidelity of administration, student results data will help in targeting specific skills development through individualized and/or small group interventions. For this year's administration of the RSN, the CS #2 short-term and intermediate outcomes continued to demonstrate fidelity of administration.

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

The CS #3 short-term and intermediate outcomes relate to increasing knowledge, skills, and use of student data for identifying struggling learners and monitoring student progress. Student data and teacher feedback identified the need for additional training on identifying and implementing intensive intervention.

CS #4: Systems framework = governance and TA.

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

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

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

NO

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

The PLC replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PLC serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers. School year 2023-2024 will provide implementation data related to the PLC.

Next Steps: Continued use of the observations at Palau schools and implementation and instructional coaching

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

CS#2: The MOE intermittent assessment will be implemented, it is based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment.

Next Steps: With the introduction of the MOE Intermittent Assessment in school year 2024-2025 the scale-up plan for the Reading Success Network (RSN) was not implemented in school year 2023-2024.

Anticipated Outcomes: MOE BCI leadership will assess the effectiveness of using the Intermittent assessments.

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

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

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

CS#4: MOU between MOE & the Head Start Program in effect with a request by MOE to include data sharing. A major infrastructure change for MOE was the start of Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning the school year 2022-2023, and is currently in progress.

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

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

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

Differentiated Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction
Instructional Coaching
Professional Learning Community

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

Differentiated Instruction: As part of the core instruction and multi-tiered system of supports, differentiated instruction aims to personalize lessons to accommodate struggling learners 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: an embedded professional development in the classroom, the work begins with planning with teacher that is being coached , co-teaching /facilitating in the classroom with teacher and being able to provide reflections and feedback to teachers to build not only teacher capacity and confidence in their teaching but to foster and model positive teaching relationships in the classroom with students

The Palau Professional Learning: This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes.

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 strategies then there will be short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes. Each incorporates relevant evidence-based practices (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 and strengthen its use of EBP. The documented experiences of the SSIP target school will inform MOE about the effectiveness of its processes and tools for improving student outcomes. As discussed earlier, the change in the Ministry's organizational structure streamlined programs and services that directly impact student learning under the supervision of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). The BCI now includes three Divisions: School Testing and Data Collection; Curriculum Development and Implementation; and Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing Education.

The Division of Curriculum & Instruction continues its efforts to provide professional development to ensure system coherence between assessment, curriculum, and instruction to build teaching capacity.

The SSIP efforts have shifted to targeted support prioritized through the review of data and information and communication between the target school Principal, Special Education Program Coordinator, and the Chief of Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing

Education. The what, why, and how of the SSIP implementation is led by the MOE BCI leadership to ensure that what we learn for the target school will influence the changes in system-wide policies, procedures, and practices.

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

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 instructional coaching is professional development that is embedded in the classroom that provides immediate support and the coach is facilitating the teaching and addressing every aspect of teaching to support the teacher. Using the cycle of coaching, the coaching relationships with teachers plans instructions together, plans instruction, demonstrates and the coach has an opportunity to observe, provide feedback and immediately correct. The instructional coaching support utilizes a team approach that includes an education specialist teaming with the school principal to support the identified teacher. Because this is the first year of implementation, MOE facilitated a virtual training series conducted by an off-island consultant. At the SSIP target school, the coaching team identified a new 3rd grade teacher. Specific processes, including planning meetings and observations, are being implemented. MOE tools have been developed to document the support provided and the outcomes related to changes in instructional practices.

MOE Observation Tool: This tool consists of elements for the seven teaching standards which cover aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development, which support evidence of teacher behavior changes.

CS #2: (Evaluation Plan CS #2): Beginning school year 2024-2025 MOE is implementing the Intermittent Assessments to inform instruction three times a year. The MOE Intermittent tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments. The practice tests will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intercession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform lesson plans, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed.

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

CS #4: (Evaluation Plan CS #4): Starting with Kindergarten 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 in the collaborative partnership between MOE and Head Start to address the grade retention rate of 1st graders.

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.

The MOE contracted a licensed Special Education Teacher & Instructional Coach to assist in developing and providing quality teacher training in IEP development, laws, and processes, student assessments, data collection, curriculum interventions, and strategies. The following rationale addresses the various needs of students with disabilities in the Palau schools:

Using the instructional coaching cycle, an embedded professional development in the classroom, the work begins with planning with teacher that is being coached, co-teaching /facilitating in the classroom with teacher and being able to provide reflections and feedback to teachers to build not only teacher capacity and confidence in their teaching but to foster and model positive teaching relationships in the classroom with students.

Providing professional development trainings on writing meaningful and legally defensible IEPs.

Supporting teachers and support staff in identifying, developing, and implementing curriculum, assessment, and instructional strategies designed to improve the learning of students with disabilities.

Working with classroom teachers in planning for students learning outcomes based on assessed needs of individuals and the use of data and information to determine each student's current knowledge and skill level, support student learning goals, and assess student progress. The assessment of student needs includes the use of district approved assessment tools and strategies in addition to the teachers own professional practice.

Working collaboratively in a professional learning community with other teachers, support staff, and others as appropriate, in addressing the needs of students and implementing effective teaching and learning practices. Through collaboration, the Special Education Instructional Coach provides appropriate consultation and interventions for students who are at risk and facilitates the identification of students for special education when appropriate.

Working with teachers and staff in using research-based instructional and learning strategies and content specific, differentiated instruction including assisting teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing lessons. This includes providing consultation to school staff working with students with disabilities in the following areas: instruction, assessment, curriculum, communication, behavior, organization, use of visual systems, self-management, sensory needs, social skills and the design of the physical environment in the classroom

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

Intermittent assessments are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment. This assessment will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intercession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform instruction, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed.

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

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

reinforce through professional development.

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

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

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

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

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

Instructional Coaching : Using the instructional coaching cycle, an embedded professional development in the classroom, the work begins with planning with teacher that is being coached, co-teaching /facilitating in the classroom with teacher and being able to provide reflections and feedback to teachers to build not only teacher capacity and confidence in their teaching but to foster and model positive teaching relationships in the classroom with students

Next Steps: Coaching data in school year 2024-2025 will assist in prioritizing targeted training and technical assistance to the schools.

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

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

YES

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

The ROP just changed the SIMR and will be monitoring evaluation data to decide whether any further modifications to the SSIP will be warranted.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates parents and community partners 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 parents and community partners' input. ROP's Parent and Community Partners 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 example, in October 10 of 2024 we met with SEAC on several issues related to the SPP/APR, participation of students with disabilities in assessments.

For the FFY 2020 to FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from 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 parents and community partners. 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 to our parents and community parents , the development and implementation of Palau Schools/ROP SPP Indicator 17: SSIP includes key personnel under the Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction: Special Ed Coordinator, all content specialist , special ed teachers and special ed specialist . The SSIP School Team are 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.

Specific strategies for engagement of stakeholders, in particular, the teachers include small group sessions to target specific training and technical assistance needs. The MOE BCI leadership has prioritized targeted support to the schools., including the SSIP target school. Improvement efforts are addressed through the on-going feedback received from principals, teachers, and parents. In October of 2024, the Stakeholders were convened to discuss the proposed changes to the SIMR (scale up from one target school to all Palau elementary schools, eliminate the measure for students without disabilities). The stakeholders agreed with the scale up initiative and the SSIP focus on students with disabilities. No other changes to specific strategies were discussed.

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

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

Palau has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2023, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

17 - Required Actions

Indicator 18: General Supervision

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Compliance indicator: This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)
- # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

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

States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 4B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Indicator 9. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Indicator 10. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Indicator 11. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0			0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Indicator 12. 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))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Indicator 13. 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 and 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 a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0			0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Optional for FFY 2023, 2024, and 2025:

Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected

Explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

N/A

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

N/A

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0			0

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2022	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
	0		100%		N/A	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	
---	--

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023)	0
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	0

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	0
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	0

Subsequent correction: If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18 - OSEP Response

Palau is not required to establish a baseline until any fiscal year in which data are reported for this indicator.

18 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Hasinta Ida Kilcullen

Title:

Director

Email:

ikilcullen@palauschools.org

Phone:

(680) 488-2547

Submitted on:

04/22/25 9:21:25 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Palau

2025 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
60.00%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	6	0	0.00%
Compliance	10	10	100.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2025: Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education, Part B."

2025 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 3-8	72%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 3-8	72%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years	40	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years**	40	0

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

2025 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 18: General Supervision	100.00%	N/A	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	N/A		N/A
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/FFY2023-Part-B-SPP-APR-Reformatted-Measurement-Table.pdf>

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, 13 and 18.

Data Rubric

Palau

FFY 2023 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	N/A	0
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	N/A	0
10	N/A	0
11	1	1
12	N/A	0
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
18	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	18
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2023 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	23

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 7/31/24	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/8/25	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/13/24	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 9/4/24	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	27.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.28571429 points are subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	23
B. 618 Grand Total	27.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	50.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	4
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	50.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.28571429.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2025 Submission

SPP/APR Data

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

Part B 618 Data

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

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	FS002 & FS089	7/31/2024
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	3/5/2025
Part B Exiting	FS009	3/5/2025
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	3/5/2025
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/8/2025
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/13/2024
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	9/4/2024

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

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

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Palau

School Year: 2023-24

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	0
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	0
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	0
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	0
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	0
(2.1) Mediations held.	0
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	0

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	0
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	0
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	0

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	0
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	0
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Palau

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/13/2024

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2025 will be posted in June 2025. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 20, 2025

Honorable Surangel S. Whipps, Jr.
Acting Minister of Education
Republic of Palau
P.O. Box 189
Koror, PW 96940

Dear Acting Minister Whipps, Jr.:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2025 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Palau needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Palau's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2023 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Palau's 2025 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2025 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2025: Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education-Part B" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations for outlying areas, freely associated States, and the Bureau of Indian Education (the Entities) in 2025, as it did for determinations in 2024. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Palau).

In making Part B determinations in 2025, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment);
- (2) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2023-2024) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2025 determinations, OSEP is using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Indian Education, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2025 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2024 determination. OSEP used the publicly available NAEP data for the Bureau of Indian Education that was comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; specifically OSEP did not use NAEP participation data in making the BIE's 2025 determination because the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the BIE that is publicly available is 2020, whereas the most recently administered NAEP participation data for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico that is publicly available is 2024);
- (3) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (4) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2025 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered performance on timely correction of noncompliance requirements in Indicator 18. While the State's performance on timely correction of noncompliance was a factor in each State or Entity's 2025 Part B Compliance Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2025 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2026 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Palau's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Palau-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Palau's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 18, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Palau is required to take. The actions that Palau is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Palau's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2025 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Palau's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2023-2024," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Palau's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Palau's 2025 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2025 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State's or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2022, 2023, and 2024), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2025 determination.

Palau's determination for 2024 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Palau of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following website: [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Palau to work with appropriate entities. The Secretary directs Palau 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. We strongly encourage Palau to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Palau must report with its FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 2, 2026, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Palau received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Palau took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.606, Palau must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

The Secretary is considering modifying the factors the Department will use in making its determinations in June 2026 and beyond, as part of the Administration's priority to empower States in taking the lead in developing and implementing policies that best serve children with disabilities, and empowering parents with school choice options. As we consider changes to data collection and how we use the data reported to the Department in making annual IDEA determinations, OSEP will provide parents, States, entities, and other stakeholders with an opportunity to comment and provide input through a variety of mechanisms.


For the FFY 2024 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2026, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2024 SPP/APR and the 2026 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and data submitted during correction opportunities will not be used for these purposes. The 2024-25 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the appropriate EDFacts system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Palau must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on its agency website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing an Entity Profile that:

- (1) includes Palau's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Palau's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Palau over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,



David J. Cantrell
Deputy Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Palau Director of Special Education

