

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Palau



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Republic of Palau (ROP) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2019. A description of ROP's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR and how ROP will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of ROP's FFY 2019 APR.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018, with FFY 2019 targets identified in ROP's FFY 2018 APR. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 13 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, ROP reports FFY 2019 data to determine if ROP met its FFY 2019 target, provides an explanation of slippage if ROP did not meet its target, and responds to any issue identified for the Indicator in the June 25, 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter and ROP's FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

As required, for Indicator 17, ROP's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), ROP will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year Five Report no later than April 1, 2021. Per OSEP's guidance, ROP's SSIP Phase III-Year Five Report will provide data and analysis, consistent with its evaluation plan, on the extent to which ROP has made progress towards or has met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes for implementation of its SSIP and has made progress in achieving ROP's State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for children with disabilities.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, ROP schools were closed mid-March 2020 for the rest of the school year. With the exception of Indicator 3 data, the school closure did not impact the collection and reporting of required data for ROP's FFY 2019 APR. ROP implemented the public health social distancing requirement but did not require wearing of face masks. The MOE Special Education Program was able to conduct IEP team meetings at school with social distancing in place, and with parent permission, conduct individual assessments for eligibility determination.

Beginning school year 2020-2021, ROP opened schools with regular hours and instruction, as they were before the mid-March 2020 shutdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

As of this APR submission, ROP continues to be COVID-19-free. No positive COVID-19 tests have been reported.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System

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

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary education system that includes 17 elementary schools for grades 1-8 and one public high school for grades 9-12. The Special Education Program is a program under the direct supervision of the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). The delivery of special education and related services is provided within the schools under the supervision of the school principals. The Chief of the Division of School Management serves as the direct supervisor of the school principals.

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

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

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

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary system that provides timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to schools. The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI) is responsible for developing appropriate curricula with instructional materials for all public schools and providing training and support to school personnel for ensuring the educational programs result in successful students in Palauan society and the world. The BCI includes content, assessment, and training specialists who provide the technical assistance, training, and support to school personnel, including special education teachers. The Special Education Program Coordinator and Specialists collaborate with the BCI Chiefs and Specialists for improving instructional programs and services for all students, including students with disabilities.

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

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

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

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

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

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

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

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

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP's Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (also known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP's stakeholder involvement.

ROP's stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP's IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education, for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP's SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinators, Specialists, and School Administrators, serving as ROP's SSIP Core Team, with regular updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors and Chiefs. Also, the SSIP Target School Team, composed of the school administrators and teachers, serve as key stakeholders to ensure feedback on the SSIP implementation progress by the teachers who work directly with the students is incorporated in the implementation and evaluation priorities for improvement.

Highlights of MOE's engagement with ROP stakeholders for the development of ROP's FFY 2013-2019 SPP, FFY 2019 APR, and the development of ROP's SPP: SSIP Indicator 17 included the following:

Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC):

SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. The SEAC acknowledged the reasons for slippage. Although there wasn't improved performance in all the FFY 2019 APR performance, the SEAC indicated no reasons for revising any of the FFY 2019 targets. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

Quarterly Updates of Special Education Program to the Ministry of Education's Management Team and all School Principals:

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the MOE quarterly meetings were cancelled until school year 2020-2021. As scheduled, the Special Education Coordinator presented the ROP FFY2020 Determination (Needs Intervention) and an overview of how that was determined based on ROP's performance as reported in FFY2018 APR, Part B 618 Data Report and FFY2020 Part B Grant's specific condition with emphasis of strengthening MOE's commitment and efforts in improving results for children with disabilities. The Special Education Coordinator provided heads up on upcoming submissions of FFY2019 SPP/APR, FFY2019 SSIP Phase III Year Five, and FFY2021 Part B Grant Application and shared information about the NCSI Pacific Cross-State Learning Collaborative with emphasis on the participation of the SSIP Core Team during the November 2020 virtual convening. Information was also shared on virtual training schedules for CRTs, teachers, related service providers including child specific technical assistance that involved school teams. An overview of the MOE's Bookshare Guidelines and Recommendation Form was presented with an assurance that CRTs will work with their respective schools to become more adept in this new process. Bookshare, an OSEP-funded e-library provides accessible reading materials for eligible students with print disabilities. Shared results of the December 2020 Offsite Monitoring and acknowledged the schools' efforts and contributions of key personnel involved in maintaining compliance of specific IDEA requirements reviewed.

SSIP Core Team:

The ROP SSIP Core team continues to meet at least monthly to review ROP's SSIP implementation progress, FFY 2019 State-Identified Measurable Results (SiMR) results, and implementation of evaluation measures. The meetings included updates to the calendar of activities to ensure progress toward meeting the SiMRs. As required, for Indicator 17, ROP's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), ROP will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year Five Report no later than April 1, 2021.

Other Activities Related to Stakeholders:

Public Awareness:

During an MOE radio talk show activity, Special Education Coordinator and the Principal of the SSIP Target School shared information about special education services and an overview of ROP SSIP Activities.

The Special Education Coordinator was invited to share general guidelines for parents of children with disabilities receiving special education services during a parent workshop which was one of the activities to celebrate the International Day of Persons with Disabilities. Other special education staff members either participated in another parent training on a different day or in the parade with all participants as the closing activity.

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

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

Republic of Palau (ROP) is a unitary system and does not have LEAs. As required, ROP reports annually to the public on the progress and/or slippage in meeting the 'measurable and rigorous targets' found in its SPP through posting its APR. ROP will post its SPP/APR annually within 120 days following ROP's submission of its SPP/APR, including any revisions if ROP has revised its SPP. ROP posts its complete SPP and all APRs on the following ROP MOE website: <http://www.palau.moe.net/sped/>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, Palau must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, Palau must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, Palau must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since Palau's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required, for Indicator 17, ROP's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), ROP will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year Five Report no later than April 1, 2021. Per OSEP's guidance, ROP's SSIP Phase III-Year Five Report will provide data and analysis, consistent with its evaluation plan, on the extent to which ROP has made progress towards or has met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes for implementation of its SSIP and has made progress in achieving ROP's State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) for children with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on Palau's IDEA Part B grant award each year from FFY 2017 through FFY 2020 related to policies and procedures regarding qualifications for special education teachers, pursuant to section 612(a)(14)(C) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.156(c).

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, Palau does not have any FFY 2019 data for indicator 17.

Intro - Required Actions

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

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	70.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	30.00%	30.00%	40.00%		70.10%
Data	25.00%	33.33%	33.33%	70.00%	16.67%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	70.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. The SEAC acknowledged the reasons for slippage. Although there wasn't improved performance in all the FFY 2019 APR performance, the SEAC indicated no reasons for revising any of the FFY 2019 targets. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	10
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	20.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2	10	16.67%	70.10%	20.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

Other

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Graduation Conditions: 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 dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	18.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	10.00%	7.00%	7.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	5.88%	8.57%	3.33%	7.41%	18.18%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. The SEAC acknowledged the reasons for slippage. Although there wasn't improved performance in all the FFY 2019 APR performance, the SEAC indicated no reasons for revising any of the FFY 2019 targets. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	2
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	4
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	0
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	4
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	0

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), ROP does not report drop-out data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA. ROP uses Option 2 for reporting drop-out rates, consistent with its FFY 2010 SPP/APR.

With stakeholder input, ROP continues to choose Option 2 to report drop-out rates for Indicator 2. ROP uses the high school enrollment and reported IDEA 618 Exit data to calculate drop out rate following the one-year lag data requirement. In school year 2018-2019, there were four youth with an IEP who dropped out of high school. The enrollment data for high school was taken from the ROP Ministry of Education Research and Evaluation Division and verified with the high school.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4	18	18.18%	2.00%	22.22%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

ROP reported a total of 4 students with IEPs who dropped out from high school, which represented the same number from previous year's FFY 2018 APR Indicator 2 data. The slippage in performance by 4.04% from 18.18% (4/22) in FFY 2018 to 22.22% (4/18) in FFY 2019 was due to the decrease in the total enrollment of high school students with IEPs from 22 in FFY 2018 APR to 18 in FFY 2019.

As discussed in the Stakeholder Input section, in January 2021, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school. This support is intended to encourage youth with IEPs to stay in school, which would decrease the number of drop-outs.

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

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%		95.00%
A	Overall	73.47%	Actual	79.49%	96.77%	94.29%	73.47%	85.71%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%		95.00%
A	Overall	65.31%	Actual	76.92%	96.77%	94.29%	65.31%	87.50%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, schools closed in March 2020 for the rest of the school year. The ROP MOE did not administer its state-wide assessments, as with other education systems in the U.S. states and entities. USDOE approved waivers to states for the administration of the Spring 2020 state-wide assessments.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			85.71%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			87.50%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, Palau did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	15.00%	25.00%	35.00%		35.00%
A	Overall	30.56%	Actual	22.58%	26.67%	30.30%	30.56%	17.02%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%		35.00%
A	Overall	34.38%	Actual	26.67%	26.67%	18.18%	34.38%	26.53%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	35.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	35.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, schools closed in March 2020 for the rest of the school year. The ROP MOE did not administer its state-wide assessments, as with other education systems in the U.S. states and entities. USDOE approved waivers to states for the administration of the Spring 2020 state-wide assessments.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			17.02%	35.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			26.53%	35.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, Palau did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. The SEAC acknowledged the reasons for slippage. Although there wasn't improved performance in all the FFY 2019 APR performance, the SEAC indicated no reasons for revising any of the FFY 2019 targets. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

ROP is a unitary system and does not include LEAs. Therefore, determination of "significant discrepancy" is based on data comparison of two groups - students without disabilities and students with disabilities.

Definition of "significant discrepancy": Reported in the FFY 2006 APR, resubmitted in April 2008, ROP continues to define significant discrepancy as a relative difference that exceeds .5.

This is calculated as follows:

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

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

The difference in the rates of suspension between (a) and (b) equals (a) – (b). The relative difference in the rates of suspension/expulsion equals (a) – (b) / (b).

FFY 2019 reported data represent the one-year data lag requirement with the relative difference calculated as follows using data from 2018-2019:

1.28% (1/78=students with disabilities) – 1.33% (29/2188=students without disabilities) = -0.05/1.33 = -0.04 Relative Difference.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

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

In FFY 2019, ROP did not report significant discrepancy and did not identify noncompliance.

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 4B is not applicable to ROP.

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

This Indicator is not applicable to Palau.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target >=	55.00%	55.00%	57.00%	60.00%	62.00%
A	18.00%	Data	58.00%	58.24%	63.95%	59.15%	60.00%
B	2005	Target <=	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%	11.00%	11.00%
B	19.00%	Data	9.00%	13.19%	17.44%	16.90%	13.75%
C	2005	Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
C	3.00%	Data	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	
Target B <=	
Target C <=	

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	84
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	48

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 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 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	48	84	60.00%		57.14%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12	84	13.75%		14.29%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	84	0.00%		0.00%	N/A	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ROP transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacted ROP's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, ROP's slippage status for FFY 2019 indicates "NA" for this indicator because ROP has re-established baseline for this indicator, using data from the IDEA Section 618 Environments data.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. Palau transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts Palau's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, Palau's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator. However, Palau must revise the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019.

5 - Required Actions

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

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

(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

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2011	Target >=	80.00%	83.00%	83.00%	86.00%	100.00%
A	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	0.00%
B	2011	Target <=	2.00%	1.00%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	0.00%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	
Target B <=	

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	6
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	5
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	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 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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	5	6	0.00%		83.33%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	6	0.00%		0.00%	N/A	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ROP transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacted ROP's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, ROP's slippage status for FFY 2019 indicates "NA" for this indicator because ROP has re-established baseline for this indicator, using data from the IDEA Section 618 Environments data.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. Palau transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts Palau's data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, Palau's slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator. However, Palau must revise the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019.

6 - Required Actions

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

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2008	Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
A1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%
A2	2008	Target >=	60.00%	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	100.00%

A2	100.00%	Data	75.00%	40.00%	33.33%		0.00%
B1	2008	Target >=	70.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	100.00%
B1	100.00%	Data	75.00%	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%
B2	2008	Target >=	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	100.00%
B2	100.00%	Data	50.00%	20.00%	33.33%		0.00%
C1	2008	Target >=	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	100.00%
C1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		100.00%
C2	2008	Target >=	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	67.00%	100.00%
C2	100.00%	Data	75.00%	40.00%	100.00%		0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	100.00%
Target A2 >=	100.00%
Target B1 >=	100.00%
Target B2 >=	100.00%
Target C1 >=	100.00%
Target C2 >=	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. The SEAC acknowledged the reasons for slippage. Although there wasn't improved performance in all the FFY 2019 APR performance, the SEAC indicated no reasons for revising any of the FFY 2019 targets. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

During the January 2021 SEAC meeting, the ROP Special Education APR team explained that that ROP does not have FFY 2019 data to report for Indicator 7. As indicated in Indicator 6, there were six preschoolers with disabilities accounted for in the December 1, 2019 IDEA Child Count and Environments data. These six preschoolers with disabilities, which include the one preschooler with a disability reported in last year's Indicator 6 performance data, continue to receive special education preschool services.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

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		
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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			100.00%	100.00%		N/A	N/A

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
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>			0.00%	100.00%		N/A	N/A

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning		
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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>			100.00%	100.00%		N/A	N/A
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>			0.00%	100.00%		N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning		
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers		
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it		
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers		

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age			100.00%	100.00%		N/A	N/A

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>			0.00%	100.00%		N/A	N/A

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As described in the Stakeholder Input section, ROP does not have FFY 2019 data to report for Indicator 7. As indicated in Indicator 6, there were six preschoolers with disabilities accounted for in the December 1, 2019 IDEA Child Count and Environments data. These six preschoolers with disabilities, which include the one preschooler with a disability reported in last year's Indicator 6 performance data, continue to receive special education preschool services.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

Palau reported that there were a total of six preschoolers with disabilities accounted for in the December 1, 2019 IDEA Child Count and Environments data, and those six preschoolers continue to receive special education preschool services. Because Palau did not report that any preschoolers turned 6 years old or exited the program during the reporting period, Palau did not have data to report for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether Palau met its target.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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 ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. The SEAC acknowledged the reasons for slippage. Although there wasn't improved performance in all the FFY 2019 APR performance, the SEAC indicated no reasons for revising any of the FFY 2019 targets. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Preschool	2005	Target >=	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%
Preschool	88.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	85.71%	100.00%	71.43%
School age	2005	Target >=	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%
School age	43.00%	Data	91.57%	93.42%	90.00%	96.83%	98.65%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	93.00%
Target B >=	99.00%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	8	8	71.43%	93.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
School age	72	76	98.65%	99.00%	94.74%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In FFY 2019, ROP did not meet its target of 99% for parent respondents of the school-age group and reported slippage by a 3.91% decrease from 98.65% (73/74) in FFY 2018 to 94.74% (72/76) in FFY 2019. The slippage represents a number of new parents whose children started receiving services at the beginning of the new school year as well as in the middle of the new school year. The MOE Special Education Program continues to facilitate parent training that happens every summer. The program will tap into school Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings to occur throughout the year to strengthen parent involvement as a means for improving services and results for children and youth with disabilities.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

87

Percentage of respondent parents

96.55%

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
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

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

In FFY 2019, the total number of surveys disseminated was 87; of which, eight surveys were for parents of preschoolers with an IEP and 79 surveys were for parents of school-age students with an IEP:

Preschool survey return rate = 100% (8/8)
School-Age survey return rate = 96.20% (76/79)

ROP reports that the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. All children with an IEP were accounted for in the dissemination of the parent survey. The return rate for preschoolers with an IEP was 100% (8/8); representative of all preschoolers with an IEP.

For school-age students with an IEP, the return rate was 96.20% (76/79). Three of the 79 surveys disseminated were not returned. ROP reviewed the ethnicity and school levels for determining representation.

Race/Ethnicity

In FFY 2019, 100% (76/76) of the respondents indicated "Palauan" as their race/ethnic group. This was representative of the overall percentage of surveys disseminated to all parents by race/ethnicity, which was 100% (79/79) "Pacific Islander" which includes "Palauan."

Grade Level

Surveys received for FFY 2019 with valid responses from parents of children in the elementary level was 80.26% (61/76), which is representative of the overall surveys disseminated at the elementary level at 81.01% (64/79). The high school level reported 100% return rate at 15 returned out of 15 disseminated.

ROP State of Residence

For FFY 2019, valid responses for this demographic item demonstrated that the top three states of residents were: Koror (57.89% or 44/76), Airai (17.11% or 13/76), and Ngarchelong, Ngchesar, and Peleliu with each having 3.95% or 3/76 respectively. The top two states of residents (Koror and Airai) remain the same from FFY 2018 and FFY 2017.

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 FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 9 is not applicable to ROP.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 10 is not applicable to ROP.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	67.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.44%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
26	26	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source: The evaluation data was taken from the database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020. 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)

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, ROP schools were closed mid-March 2020 for the rest of the school year. The school closure however did not impact the 60-day timeline requirement for conducting initial evaluations because MOE Special Education evaluators were able to conduct the test individually at school, home, or at the special education office or online. ROP required social distancing but did not require wearing of face masks. With permission from the parents, the individual assessments were conducted. As of this APR submission, ROP continues to be COVID-19-free. No COVID-19 positive tests have been reported.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 12 is not applicable to ROP. ROP is not an eligible entity under IDEA Part C.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

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: Secondary transition: 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 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 was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	98.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
18	18	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source: The secondary transition data was taken from the database system of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition 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.

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)

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, schools closed from mid-March 2020 through the rest of the school year. ROP implemented the social distancing requirement but no requirement for wearing of face masks. The MOE Special Education Program was able to conduct IEP team meetings at school with social distancing in place. As of this APR submission, ROP continues to be COVID-19-free. No positive COVID-19 tests have been reported.

Beginning school year 2020-2021, ROP opened schools with regular hours and instruction, as they were before the mid-March 2020 shutdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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: Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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, 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.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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.

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 should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%
A	11.00%	Data	14.29%	16.67%	40.00%	40.00%	0.00%
B	2009	Target >=	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	60.00%
B	56.00%	Data	57.14%	33.33%	60.00%	60.00%	20.00%
C	2009	Target >=	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	100.00%
C	100.00%	Data	85.71%	83.33%	100.00%	70.00%	60.00%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	50.00%
Target B >=	60.00%
Target C >=	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) serves as ROP's broad stakeholder group for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of ROP's APR. The SEAC met in January 2021 to review ROP's FFY 2019 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage. The SEAC acknowledged the reasons for slippage. Although there wasn't improved performance in all the FFY 2019 APR performance, the SEAC indicated no reasons for revising any of the FFY 2019 targets. In addition, the SEAC decided to continue prioritizing efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	9
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	0
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	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)	4
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).	1

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	0	9	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1	9	20.00%	60.00%	11.11%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	6	9	60.00%	100.00%	66.67%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	<p>For FFY 2019, ROP did not meet its target of 60% for indicator 14B, reporting outcomes at 11.11% (1/9) with slippage from the previous year's outcomes of 20% (1/5). Although the slippage accounted for the decrease in percentage from year to year, the number of leavers engaged in competitive employment remained the same from year to year. Hence, it is important to consider ROP's small n size as the ratio may fluctuate considerably if the numbers change by 1.</p> <p>A review of the surveys indicated that one of the reasons for the slippage in indicator 14B was that a majority of the respondents preferred to participate in other education or training opportunities such as Job Corp and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA) programs.</p> <p>The high school continues to focus on ensuring students complete coursework needed to earn a regular high school diploma and obtain a Career Technical Education certificate in the vocational trade of their choice. Based on each student's Post-Secondary Transition Plan and Goals, as determined by the student's IEP team members, the high school continues to make efforts in meeting each student's educational needs for higher education, future employment, and other education, training, or employment opportunities. Through continued partnerships with the WIOA agency, paid training opportunities were made available for students to build their knowledge and skills in the workplace. The local community college also continues to provide workshops to inform senior students and their parents of programs offered at the college as well as to assist them in completing admissions and financial aid.</p> <p>In addition, during the January 2021 SEAC meeting, the SEAC prioritized continuing the council's efforts to improve supports and services for youth with disabilities pursuing higher education or employment after high school.</p>

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

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.

ROP reports that the FFY 2019 leaver 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. ROP reports 100% (9/9) leaver response rate for FFY 2019.

The ROP 2018-2019 IDEA 618 exit report included a total of 10 exiters: two graduates with a high school diploma; four who exited with a certificate; and four who dropped out. One of the exiters who dropped out returned to high school the following year, school year 2019-2020. For reporting FFY 2019 Indicator 14 leaver data, nine of the 2018-2019 exiters were considered leavers from high school and all nine completed the post-school outcomes survey.

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

Palau reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. 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 ED Facts 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 baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

Palau reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. Palau is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - 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:

Nora Renguul

Title:

Special Education Coordinator

Email:

norarenguul@palaumoe.net

Phone:

+6804882568

Submitted on:

04/29/21 8:48:10 AM