

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).**

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

SIMR #2: Increase proficiency percentage from Pre to Post PERA in reading comprehension for grades 1-3 for students with and without disabilities in the target school.

SIMR #3: Decrease the percentage of 1st-3rd grade repeaters in the target school.

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

**If “Yes”, provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making.**

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below.**

**Baseline Data:** Refer to Attachment 1

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

**FFY 2018 Target:** Refer to Attachment 1    **FFY 2019 Target:** Refer to Attachment 1

**FFY 2018 Data:** Refer to Attachment 1    **FFY 2019 Data:** Refer to Attachment 1

**Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met?** No

**Did slippage<sup>1</sup> occur?** Yes

**If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage.**

**Attachment 1** displays the baseline, targets, and performance for the seven SIMR measures of the three SIMR areas. For the four measures of SIMR #1 and #2, no data were available in FFY 2019. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, schools were closed from March 23, 2020 until the end of the 2019-2020 school year. ROP did not administer any Spring 2020 state-wide assessments, including the Palau English Reading Assessment (PERA) used for SIMR #1 and #2. In addition, the SSIP target school, Koror Elementary, did not complete the third Reading Success Network (RSN) English reading screener due to the school closure.

As displayed in **Attachment 1**, SIMR #3 included three measures: decrease in repeaters for grades 1-3. Grade 1 and Grade 3 did not meet the FFY 2019 target for their respective grade, and Grade 2 met the FFY 2019 target. Grade 1 showed improvement from the previous year's performance from 9.38% (9/96) in FFY 2018 to 0.96% (1/104) in FFY 2019. Grade 3's FFY 2019 performance represented slippage by 1.14% from 3.41% (3/88) in FFY 2018 to 4.55% (4/88) in FFY 2019. By numbers, this slippage represented a difference of one student.

The reason for the Grade 3 slippage could be attributed to the school closure. As described in page 5, schools were closed in March 2020 - May 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. During this period, schools provided opportunities for remote learning through learning packets. This required submission of completed assignments by the students. School teachers followed up with their students, but the students were required to submit all assignments to pass their Core subject areas.

---

<sup>1</sup> The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
  - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
  - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
  - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
  - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021****FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

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

**If “Yes”, describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

RSN is used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions. RSN screener was one of the resources utilized to develop the PERA. It is administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year. The end of year RSN was not conducted in Spring 2020 due to school closure.

With classes resuming a regular schedule in 2020-2021, RSN was administered three times this year. **Attachment 2** provides proficiency percentages by element by grade for the three screenings. As shown, by the third screening in March 2021, 85.71% (18/21) of the elements showed at least 80% of the students were proficient in that skill, with a range from 85% to 100% for Grade 1, 80% to 97.5% for Grade 2, and 85% to 100% for Grade 3. The remaining three elements or 14.29% (3/21) represented the comprehension element for all three grades: 65% for Grade 1, 67.5% for Grade 2, and 65% for Grade 3.

**Attachment 3** provides the RSN trend and cohort data. The trend data showed that over the last three years, beginning of year results by grade represented a decrease in performance for most elements in grades 1 and 2. Grade 3 showed improvement, with the exception of a drop in comprehension from August 2019 to August 2020 beginning of year screening.

**Attachment 3** also includes a review of beginning of year results by cohort group for the last three years: Grade 1 in August 2018, Grade 2 in August 2019, Grade 3 in August 2020. These grades represent the “cohort” that moved from year to year by grade. The August 2020 Grade 3 percentages significantly increased from the August 2018 screening when this “cohort” was Grade 1. The comprehension element increased by 25.85% from 36.9% in August 2019 to 62.75% in August 2020.

These data reviews show progress towards the SIMR and confirms a possible reason for the significant decrease in repeaters (SIMR #3) for each grade (**Attachment 1**).

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021****FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period?**

No

**If “Yes”, describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

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

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all schools closed on March 23, 2020 until May 19, 2020, the end of the 2019-2020 school year. All Spring 2020 statewide assessments including Post-PERA were canceled, along with the final RSN screening at Koror Elementary. ROP therefore was not able to report FFY 2019 performance data for SIMR #1 and #2.

During the school closure, ROP explored and implemented remote learning options and various ways of gathering student data in an effort to sustain learning. From March 2020-May 2020, the remote learning options included learning packets picked up by families for the students to complete, and beginning mid-April 2020, the Edmodo app, google classrooms, and messenger via Facebook were used as on-line resources for teachers, parents, and students to interact and support the completion of activities from the learning packets. Home visits were also conducted for students who were not submitting assignments. In addition, for special education students, the special education teachers conducted home visits two to four times a week to review their assigned learning packets and provide specially designed instruction based on their IEPs. Home visits were also conducted for students with an IEP that required related services, such as speech services.

With no reported COVID-19 positive cases, which continue through today, ROP resumed a regular class schedule from the beginning of school year 2020-2021. Travel restrictions into Palau are still in place to prevent the corona virus from entering the island nation of the ROP.

From July 2020-December 2020 MOE facilitated professional development that focused on distance learning strategies for teachers and parents to prepare teachers and families should face-to-face instruction is not an option due to a public health emergency. Teachers were encouraged to utilize the tablets and apps (Edmodo app, google classrooms, etc.) for on-line classrooms as part of their instructional day.

Data collection resumed in school year 2020-2021. Due to the travel restrictions, technical assistance and training activities from off-island consultants continue to be provided virtually.

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

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

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

**If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.**

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? Yes**

**If “Yes”, describe each new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.**

During the school closure, professional development and technical assistance pivoted to support families on how to support their children engage in the remote learning options. MOE also had to address the internet access issues at the schools for school administrators and teachers and at homes for the families. The MOE partnered with the Palau National Communication Corporation (PNCC), the leading telecommunication system in Palau, to offer families free megabytes to access the internet to engage in the follow-up communication with their children's school.

In July 2020, the MOE held its annual education convention which was the first face-to-face system-wide professional development since the school closure. For principals, a July 2020 training was also conducted on the new observation tool developed based on the MOE teacher standards. This tool was implemented beginning school year 2020-2021.

MOE Observation Tool changes compared to the previous observation tool include additional practice indicators to demonstrate effective planning and implementation of evidence-based practices. The use of the MOE Observation Tool is not new, but the updates to the instrument provides more elements for demonstrating meeting the teacher standards. The original tool includes five sections, with 19 performance indicators; of which three sections with 12 practice indicators are used in the SSIP evaluation for measuring teacher behavior changes. The new tool includes six sections with 49 practice indicators; of which 23 practice indicators are related to the previous indicators observed. The SSIP Core Team determined that with the changes to the MOE Observation Tool, the use of the tool will re-establish baseline for implementation.

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State continued to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.**

**Coherent Strategy (CS) #1 & #2:**

As in previous years, ROP continued implementing the teacher self-assessment survey, entitled “How do I feel?” (HDIF), to gather teacher perceptions of their knowledge and skills in reading instruction. The survey results supported the development and implementation of professional development activities. This survey is administered twice a year.

The RSN screening was administered three times this year with a refresher training conducted for teachers prior to the initial screening administration. Results show in the student progress, as well as supports for planning professional development activities to improve instruction in reading comprehension.

The RSN observation was conducted through the use of the “Screening Administration Observation Checklist,” the reviews six areas of the screening process including materials, time, set up, administration, scoring, and accommodations for students with IEPs. This observation is done for all the screening. The results of these observations show that the teachers' administrative management of the screening has improved over the years. They seem to know what is expected of them and what to expect during the time of initial, middle, and final screening.

The MOE Observation Tool has been revised, updated, and implemented this school year. This new tool consists of seven teaching standards such as: 1) Teacher Professionalism, 2) Teacher Cultural Sensitivity, 3) Planning for Learning, 4) Teaching for Learning, 5) Technology Integration, 6) Assessing for Learning, and 7) Managing for Learning. This new tool covers more aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development. This tool will support evidence for teacher behavior change.

The Mentor/Mentee program serves as a coaching support for new teachers or teachers who need extra assistance in teaching. The Principal assigned mentor teachers as coaches for mentees where they are required to work side by side with mentees to improve their teaching skills. Mentors are required to make at least three observations each quarter and provide feedback, which will provide information on how teacher change is occurring.

**CS #3:**

Student data review process includes the Student Reading Profile that was updated to be used for struggling learners to keep track of their performances and provide intervention. Implementation scheduled in the 2021-2022 school year.

**CS #4:**

Collaboration with Head Start - Student orientation day included conducting first part of the 1st grade RSN screening. This allowed for information about what the student is able to do in name writing and alphabet recognition for both upper and lower case. School year 2020-2021 is the third year of implementing this data gathering for incoming 1st graders.

The MOE Kindergarten Checklist was shared with the SSIP Core Team as a tool to be adapted for use by schools, such as Koror Elementary. The Core Team will review the tool and consider how it will be adapted to collect additional data for teachers in their planning to receive incoming 1st graders beginning school year 2021-2022.

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



**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy.**

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

**CS #1a.1:** HDIF. How do I feel? survey results continued to show an implementation level of 2 with an overall percentage of 75% (21/28) for both surveys conducted in January 2021 and March 2021. This could be due to new teachers for this school year.

**CS #1a.2 & CS #1b.3:** Lesson Plans. Based on the two observations conducted in February 2021 and March 2021, results showed an implementation level of 1 with an overall percentage of 44.44% (12/27). The same implementation level was reported for the nine mentees observed with an overall percentage of 50% (9/18). It should be noted that the observations used the new tool that included additional practice indicators as compared to the original tool. The results will be considered baseline.

**CS #1a.3 & CS #1b.4:** Evidence-Based Practice (EBP). Based on the two observations conducted in February 2021 and March 2021, results showed an implementation level of 0 with an overall percentage of 25.93% (7/27). The same implementation level was reported for the nine mentees observed with an overall percentage of 22.22% (4/18). It should be noted that the observations used the new tool that included additional practice indicators as compared to the original tool. The results will be considered baseline.

**CS #1b.1:** Training Evaluation. Two training activities were conducted in January 2021 and March 2021 that focused on lesson planning, differentiating instruction, and adaptations. The evaluation summaries showed an implementation level of 3 with an overall percentage of 91.30% (21/23).

**CS #2.1 & CS #2.3:** Screening Observations and Refresher Training. The training session feedback indicated an implementation level of 3 with 100% (28/28). The observations of the screening indicated an implementation level of 2 with 88.89% (32/36) for the three observations conducted. Although the training indicated an understanding of the screening SOP, the observations revealed that the new teachers (two in August; one in December and March) needed additional support for implementation.

**CS #2.2:** Screening Progress Data. Reviewing progress from screening to screening is provided in **Attachments 2 and 3**, with discussion on results in page 3.

**CS #3.1:** Focus of Concern. Through document reviews, there continues to be a need to address how the screening and intervention data are used for decision-making. Implementation level of 0 was reported. This was addressed in the March 2021 training. Feedback from teachers indicated a need for more training and examples.

With the new MOE Observation Tool, all measures will continue with additional support for teachers to demonstrate EBP. Through the HDIF and training evaluations, teachers express an increased understanding. However, the observations conducted indicate little to some implementation. A consideration would be to review the data by teacher for growth or improvement from one observation to another, especially for the mentees.

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

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

Even though the school was on lock down from March 2020 to May 2020, students were able to continue with their learning through on-line classes or learning packets. MOE continues to provide opportunities for parents to attend various training to prepare them should there be another school closure.

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

Next Steps: Revisions and implementation of data collection tools ongoing to assist MOE in determining and sustaining supports to the schools.

**CS#2:** Screening Administration Observation Checklist is being collected to ensure the fidelity of each screening. During each observation, teachers showed great improvement in administering screening. Formal structure for observations indicates strong implementation from previous year, which could be attributed to the refresher sessions conducted (CS #2.3).

Next Steps: Need to provide one-to-one support for individual teachers who do not meet fidelity. In addition, the review of screening results from screening to screening helps determine the common skill areas that need to be addressed for each grade-level (CS #2.2). Individual student reviews will help to target specific interventions. Based on the screening results, trainings can be developed to address particular needs.

**CS#3:** Although sessions have been conducted to review the Focus of Concern (FOC) SOP, teachers expressed a need for continued support, including examples of how to complete the process.

Next Step: To conduct a 16-hour training to walk-through the process of the FOC process and procedures, and how to use student screening results to complete the FOC.

**CS#4:** MOU between MOE & PCAA/Belau Head Start Program was in effect on October 30, 2014 until amended and approved by both parties in writing. Currently, the MOU is still in effect. On the information sharing of this memorandum, it states, "...All data will be exchanged according to their [MOE] request."

Next Step: MOE along with PCAA/Belau Head Start will schedule a meeting to revisit the MOU, and to ensure the understanding of both parties. Once it is cleared and everyone had common understanding, then MOE could ask for the data that can be used for instructional purposes.

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices? No**

**If “Yes”, describe the selection process for the new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices.**

**Provide a summary of the continued evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR.**

RSN is a universal English reading screener used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions. RSN screener was one of the resources utilized to develop the PERA. It is administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year. Continued use of RSN will support meeting the SIMR, which is measured by the PERA.

Differentiated Instructions aims to improve teachers' instruction where teachers are required to personalize the lesson to accommodate struggling learners in the classroom. Differentiated instructions are being implemented to help struggling readers and decrease retention rates.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is designed for all students to be able to access the curriculum. This promotes access for students with disabilities. UDL aims to improve students' study skills in order to be a proficient reader.

Mentor-Mentee Program serves as the coaching program to help new or struggling teachers to be able to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of the struggling learners. Mentor is required to make three observations with feedback and develop the plan to address learning challenges. Again, the mentor and mentee aim to improve teaching skills and enhance reading success in the classroom.

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

The following tools continue to be used to evaluate and monitor the fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change in accordance with ROP's Standard of Practice: Observation Tool, Lesson Plan, Focus of Concern Portfolio, Screening Fidelity Checklist, and Mentor-Mentee Portfolio.

MOE Observation tool has been revised, updated, and implemented this school year. This new tool consists of seven teaching standards such as: 1) Teacher Professionalism, 2) Teacher Cultural Sensitivity, 3) Planning for Learning, 4) Teaching for Learning, 5) Technology Integration, 6) Assessing for Learning, and 7) Managing for Learning. This new tool covers more aspects of teaching to assess practice changes and strengthen professional development. This supports the evidence of teacher changes in planning, evaluating, and delivering evidence-based practices that include screening, adaptations to lesson planning, and designing interventions.

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021****FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices.**

Professional development (PD) is developed and implemented that focuses on the area needed for teachers to improve their teaching skills. Each year, the SSIP Core Team develops a calendar where all the activities are dated and scheduled.

Activities such as Refresher Training, RSN Screening, Classroom Observation, Teacher Training, and How Do I Feel Survey? have their own data collection tool that informs the next step necessary to implement.

Refresher Training is conducted before each RSN Screening which is administered 3 times per School Year. This year, training session feedback indicated an implementation level of 3 (strong). The observations of the screening indicated an implementation level of 2 (moderate). Although the training indicated an understanding of the screening SOP, the observations revealed that the new teachers (two in August; one in December and March) needed additional support for implementation.

The new and revised MOE Classroom Observation had been implemented this school year. This new tool consists of seven teaching standards such as: 1) Teacher Professionalism, 2) Teacher Cultural Sensitivity, 3) Planning for Learning, 4) Teaching for Learning, 5) Technology Integration, 6) Assessing for Learning, and 7) Managing for Learning. This new tool covers more aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development.

Teacher training were conducted twice this year where teachers learned how to accommodate their struggling readers by implementing EBP. The first training that was implemented in January 2021 was focused on lesson plan development. The second screening was conducted in March 2021 where teachers had an opportunity to review screening results and identify students who need interventions and accommodations. Teachers were able to work with the SSIP Core team to identify EBP that can be implemented.

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

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement****Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Stakeholders are continually provided the opportunity to engage in key improvement efforts through ongoing communication and collaboration to connect school level stakeholders, MOE leadership, and special education advisory council.

- SSIP Core Team is comprised of MOE Chiefs of the Division of Curriculum and Instructional Materials Development, Division of Instructional Implementation and Teacher Training, and Division of Research and Evaluation, the target school administrator, education specialists, three central school administrators, special education coordinator and special education data manager. This team meets every 15<sup>th</sup> of the month to review student results or completed activities and plan for next steps. These three chiefs are members of the MOE Management Team.
- The SSIP Core Team meeting notice is emailed to each member with the meeting minutes of the previous meeting, agenda, and any attachment to be reviewed before each meeting with a cc to the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum of Instruction and Director of the Bureau of Education Administration.
- The target school principal shared SSIP information during PTA meeting this year.
- Target school principal and special education coordinator shared information about Special Education Program and SSIP during one of the regularly scheduled MOE radio talk show for public awareness.
- The special education advisory council are informed about SSIP during the regular meetings. The members include, the target school administrator, the chief of curriculum and instruction, and special education coordinator.
- At the school-level, the target school principal meets weekly with the primary and special education teachers to review student data and to share amongst the group best practices for addressing struggling learners. In addition, the teachers are included in the weekly Professional Learning Community (PLC) sessions to share highlights and challenges. These activities provide information to share with the SSIP Core Team in designing professional development activities for the teachers to address their needs.

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

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? Yes**

**If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

MOE leadership and personnel went through some changes due to retirement or resignation which required hiring of new people. This raised a concern relating to data review process because the recently assigned members of the SSIP Core Team representing the Division of Research and Evaluation were new to the SSIP.

The target school principal requested for another training on the Focus of Concern, a Child Find procedure. She expressed that the teachers are still not clear about the process.

**Republic of Palau (ROP) SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**  
**FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

---

**If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. Not applicable.**

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



**Attachment 1**  
**ROP SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**

ROP's SSIP FFY 2013 baseline data, FFY 2014-2019 targets, and FFY 2019 performance data for each SIMR are provided below. As indicated in Phase I and Phase II, it should be noted that the "n" size for students with disabilities is small, which raised concerns for reporting data in subsequent years. This small "n" size consideration is the reason for reporting the average proficiency percentages of all three grades instead of each grade for SIMRs #1 and #2.

SIMR	Average % of Grades 1-3						
	Baseline	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
<b>#1: KES ALL:</b> % increase of proficient in English reading comprehension in Post PERA	32%	32%	42%	52%	67%	82%	<b>82%</b>
<b>#1K-ALL: Performance:</b>	57.67%	51.67%	72.33%	63.33%	69%	<b>No Data Available</b>	
<b>#1K-ALL FFY 2019 Met Target?</b>							<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>#1: KES SpEd:</b> % increase of proficient in English reading comprehension in Post PERA	0% Based on 3 students with disabilities who took PERA	32%	42%	52%	67%	82%	<b>82%</b>
<b>#1K-SpEd: Performance:</b>	0%	25%	100%	61%	83.33%	<b>No Data Available</b>	
<b>#1K-SpEd FFY 2019 Met Target?</b>							<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>#2: KES ALL:</b> % increase of proficient in English reading comprehension from Pre to Post PERA	9% Avg Pre=23% to Avg Post=32%. 9% is difference between Pre and Post.	23%	23%	23%	28%	33%	<b>33%</b>
<b>#2K-ALL: Performance:</b>	41.33%	30.33%	45.67%	36.33%	40.67%	<b>No Data Available</b>	
<b>#2K-ALL FFY 2019 Met Target?</b>							<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>#2: KES SpEd:</b> % increase of proficient in English reading comprehension from Pre to Post PERA	0%	23%	23%	23%	28%	33%	<b>33%</b>
<b>#2K-SpEd: Performance:</b>	0%	25%	75%	61%	66.67%	<b>No Data Available</b>	
<b>#2K-SpEd FFY 2019 Met Target?</b>							<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>#3: KES ALL:</b> % decrease in grades 1-3 repeaters	Grade(G)1= 12.3% (11/89) G2= 15.1% (13/86) G3= 11.5% (11/96)	2% decrease each grade	4% decrease each grade	6% decrease each grade	8% decrease each grade	10% decrease each grade	<b>12% decrease each grade:</b> G1= 0.3% G2= 3.1% G3= 0%
<b>#3K-ALL: Performance:</b>	G1=17.92% (19/106) G2=7.59% (6/79) G3=8.79% (8/91)	G1=13.22% (16/121) G2=5.49% (5/91) G3=9.88% (8/81)	G1=12.22% (11/90) G2=11.01% (12/109) G3=4.65% (4/86)	G1= 11.24% (10/80) G2= 9.38% (9/96) G3= 2.91% (3/103)	G1= 9.38% (9/96) G2= 3.61% (3/83) G3= 3.41% (3/88)	<b>G1= 0.96% (1/104)</b> <b>G2= 2.44% (2/82)</b> <b>G3= 4.55% (4/88)</b>	
<b>#3K-ALL FFY 2019 Met Targets?</b>							<b>G1= No</b> <b>G2= Yes</b> <b>G3= No</b>

**Attachment 2**  
**ROP SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**

---

The Reading Success Network (RSN) English reading screening tool was identified as the SSIP target school's English reading screening tool, which was implemented in ROP in 2000 and was one of the resources utilized for the development of the Palau English Reading Assessment (PERA), the assessment tool for two of ROP's SIMRs.

The following tables display the proficiency percentages by the RSN screening elements for Grades 1-3 at the SSIP target school.

**SY 2020-2021 RSN Screening Results for 1<sup>st</sup> Graders**

Grade	#Tested	Elements	Screen 1 August 2020	Screen 2 December 2020	Screen 3 March 2021
1	78	AR: UC	51.5%	79.4%	100%
1	78	CAP	17.25%	47.88%	92.5%
1	78	PHA	27.75%	51.3%	97.5%
1	78	BPST	15%	38.19%	90%
1	78	NW	1.25%	31.27%	90%
1	78	HFW	0.75%	43.6%	85%
1	78	Comp	Not Administered	Not Administered	65%

**SY 2020-2021 RSN Screening Results for 2<sup>nd</sup> Graders**

Grade	#Tested	Elements	Screen 1 August 2020	Screen 2 December 2020	Screen 3 March 2021
2	79	AR: UC	88.75%	96.25%	97.5%
2	79	CAP	49%	77.62%	87.5%
2	79	PHA	65.75%	81.16%	87.5%
2	79	BPST	49.75%	70.88%	80%
2	79	NW	45%	79.6%	90%
2	79	HFW	36%	73.01%	85%
2	79	COMP	33.75%	58.66%	67.5%

**SY 2020-2021 Screening Results for 3<sup>rd</sup> Graders**

Grade	#Tested	Elements	Screen 1 August 2020	Screen 2 December 2020	Screen 3 March 2021
3	92	AR: UC	98%	97.51%	100%
3	92	CAP	86.5%	90.55%	92.5%
3	92	PHA	92.25%	95.33%	97.5%
3	92	BPST	84.75%	87.63%	90%
3	92	NW	81.75%	81.03%	90%
3	92	HFW	81%	87.17%	85%
3	92	COMP	62.75%	75.41%	65%

**Attachment 3**  
**ROP SSIP Phase III Year 5, April 1, 2021**

**RSN Screening 1 Trend Data for 1<sup>st</sup> Graders**

Grade	Elements	Screen 1: August 2018 SY2018-2019 N=103	Screen 1: Aug 2019 SY2019-2020 N=86	Screen 1: Aug 2020 SY2020-2021 N=78
1	AR: UC	59.4%	68.9%	51.5%
1	CAP	34.3%	40.7%	17.25%
1	PHA	45.2%	38.4%	27.75%
1	BPST	25.2%	27.5%	15%
1	NW	27.9%	24.3%	1.25%
1	HFW	25.9%	25.5%	0.75%
1	Comp	Not Administered	30.5%	Not Administered

**RSN Screening 1 Trend Data for 2<sup>nd</sup> Graders**

Grade	Elements	Screen 1: August 2018 SY2018-2019 N=84	Screen 1: Aug 2019 SY2019-2020 N=92	Screen 1: Aug 2020 SY2020-2021 N=79
2	AR: UC	86.8%	83.7%	88.75%
2	CAP	72.5%	67.1%	49%
2	PHA	77%	84.0%	65.75%
2	BPST	63.5%	60.3%	49.75%
2	NW	70.2%	53.2%	45%
2	HFW	55.4%	49.3%	36%
2	COMP	40.3%	36.9%	33.75%

**RSN Screening 1 Trend Data for 3<sup>rd</sup> Graders**

Grade	Elements	Screen 1 August 2018 SY2018-2019 N=86	Screen 1 Aug 2019 SY2019-2020 N=79	Screen 1 Aug 2020 SY2020-2021 N=92
3	AR: UC	99.9%	95.5%	98%
3	CAP	89.9%	81.9%	86.5%
3	PHA	94.5%	86.9%	92.25%
3	BPST	93.1%	84.6%	84.75%
3	NW	38.5%	70.3%	81.75%
3	HFW	97.9%	81.2%	81%
3	COMP	40.8%	69.3%	62.75%

**RSN Screening #1 RSN Cohort Data**

	Elements	1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Screen 1: August 2018 SY2018-2019 N=103	2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Screen 1: Aug 2019 SY2019-2020 N=92	3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Screen 1: Aug 2020 SY2020-2021 N=92
	AR: UC	59.4%	83.7%	98%
	CAP	34.3%	67.1%	86.5%
	PHA	45.2%	84.0%	92.25%
	BPST	25.2%	60.3%	84.75%
	NW	27.9%	53.2%	81.75%
	HFW	25.9%	49.3%	81%
	Comp	Not Administered	36.9%	62.75%