

PW  
Part B

FFY2017  
State Performance Plan /  
Annual Performance Report

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2017. 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 2017 APR.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2017 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. ROP's FFY 2017 performance data for Indicators 1 and 3 will be considered baseline data. For Indicator 1, OSEP required ROP to change its methodology for calculating graduation rates. For Indicator 3, ROP identified a new state-wide general assessment (IOWA) which was initially administered during school year 2017-2018. With input from stakeholders, ROP identified new targets for Indicators 1 and 3 for FFY 2018. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP. In addition, Indicators 3A and 4B measures do not apply to the ROP. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, ROP reports FFY 2017 data to determine if ROP met its FFY 2017 target, provides an explanation of slippage if ROP did not meet its target, and responds to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2018 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for ROP's FFY 2016 SPP/APR. Although ROP did not meet all its results indicator targets in FFY 2017, stakeholders recommended not to revise the targets at this time.

As required, for Indicator 17, ROP's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), ROP will submit its SSIP Phase III-year three no later than April 1, 2019. Per OSEP's guidance, ROP's SSIP Phase III-year three will provide data and analysis, consistent with its evaluation plan, on the extent to which ROP has made progress toward 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.

As required, attached is ROP's February 1, 2019 Progress Report for its IDEA Part B FFY 2018 Grant Award Specific Conditions.

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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 16 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.

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

## 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.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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. Effective June 2014, the BCI assumed administrative oversight of the Special Education Program, which changed from the Special Education Program being under the MOE Bureau of Education Administration. This change has led to more opportunities for the Special Education Program Coordinator and Specialists to collaborate with the BCI Chiefs and Specialists for improving instructional programs and services for all students, including students with disabilities.

The Special Education Program provides technical assistance and support to the schools in collaboration with the content, assessment, and training specialists. The Special Education Core Team, comprised of the Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialist (previously known as Consulting Resource Teachers - CRTs), and Data Manager hold monthly meetings 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.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### 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. Effective June 2014, the BCI assumed administrative oversight of the Special Education Program, which changed from the Special Education Program being under the MOE Bureau of Education Administration. This change has led to more opportunities for the Special Education Coordinator and Specialists to 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 forums with all school administrators, MOE Management Team, and program coordinators and specialists. The forums are designed to provide updates on all MOE programs and services, including special education, and upcoming training activities and needs in the schools.

In collaboration with the BCI Chiefs and Specialists, the Special Education Coordinator and Core Team facilitate the implementation of the prioritized training needs, including parent training. In addition, the Special Education Coordinator accesses various local, regional, and national resources to support improved related service provisions for children with disabilities.

For several years, ROP Special Education Program has had a contract with University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS). This year's consultants and trainers through Guam CEDDERS worked with the Special Education Core Team on identified needs or on-going initiatives for the provision of special education to students with disabilities, families, stakeholders and other partner agencies or programs. Guam CEDDERS has also been instrumental as a liaison on occasions for the Special Education Program with US mainland and Pacific entities on related work issues. With OSEP's Results-Driven Accountability focus, the BCI Director has endorsed ROP's commitment to the development and implementation of ROP's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as a MOE Initiative. In September 2014, the BCI Director appointed 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. In FFY-2016 with results of Phase III-year two submitted on April 2, 2018 the team began work on Phase III-year three. The SSIP Phase III-year three report will be submitted on April 1, 2019.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2017 Annual Performance Report (APR). The SPED Core Team, comprised of the Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager, is 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 its 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 Team with regular updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors and Chiefs.

Highlights of MOE's engagement with ROP stakeholders for the development of ROP's FFY 2013-2018 SPP, FFY 2017 APR, and the development of ROP's SPP: SSIP Indicator 17 included the following:

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

**January 2019:** Presentation focused on the importance of collaborative efforts, commitments, and involvement of key personnel from management down to school level in ensuring that IDEA requirements are met and children with disabilities get the services and supports to meet their needs. Shared special education child count trend data to show the decline in numbers throughout the years and relating it to Child Find procedure. Also shared information on some progress and acknowledging the efforts and contributions of key personnel involved. Lastly, challenges were shared to give everyone heads up to solicit support in addressing issues and presented upcoming program reports (e.g., 2017 APR, SSIP, Part B 618 Data, & etc.) and deadlines.

### Other Activities Relating to Stakeholders:

**November 2018:** Acting Special Education Coordinator and key program personnel participated in the Ministry of Education Monthly Radio Talk Show for public awareness.

**February 2019:** Special Education Coordinator joined a radio talk show sponsored by a nonprofit organization for individuals with disabilities to continue public awareness.

### ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC):

**July 2018:** SEAC had a meeting to elect new officers, review the ROP IDEA 2018 Determination, ROP's SSIP, and plan for the September 2018 OSEP on-site visit.

**August 2018:** SEAC meeting discussed issues relating to child find, child count and brain stormed on possible causes and solutions. Reviewed parent questions for OSEP Team during their onsite visit and had some discussion about 504 to address a parent's question. Members asked for more information about 504 vs IDEA to better understand the difference of what they are and their benefits to children with disabilities. There were also some discussion about SSIP and its current status.

**September 2018:** OSEP on-site visit included classroom observations and meetings with the target grades teachers at the ROP's SSIP school. In addition, OSEP met with the MOE Management Team to discuss ROP's IDEA Part B Grant Award Specific Condition. OSEP also met with SEAC and other parents to gather input on special education services.

**January 2019:** Acting Special Education Coordinator presented an overview of program major activities, challenges, and upcoming reports and due dates, including the APR and SSIP. Reviewed a draft of 2017 APR and identified new targets for Indicator 1 because of the change in its measurement and Indicator 3 because ROP changed their statewide general assessment from PAT (Palau Achievement Test) to IOWA Assessment.

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

## Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, 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: [www.palaumoe.net/programs/palau-special-education-program/](http://www.palaumoe.net/programs/palau-special-education-program/).

## Attachments

4/15/2019

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">pw-ffy2018specificcondition.feb2019progressreport.2.1.19.pdf</a>	June De Leon	1/31/2019 4:44 PM	

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	25.00%	14.00%	30.00%
Data		15.00%	100%	15.00%	9.00%	9.00%	5.00%	24.00%	42.00%	14.29%	25.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	30.00%	40.00%
Data	33.33%	33.33%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		70.10%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

Based on the required actions from OSEP's response to ROP's FFY 2016 APR, ROP is required to change its method for calculating graduation rates when reporting data in FFY 2017 for Indicator 1 to ensure a more accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEPs. ROP is required to use one of the following options for reporting graduation rate beginning FFY 2017:

Option 1: Four-year adjusted cohort rate required under the ESEA; or

Option 2: The same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA.

As required by OSEP, effective FFY 2017, ROP chooses to report graduation rate using Option 2, which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA. As such, ROP reports its Indicator 1 performance using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Because ROP was required to change its methodology for Indicator 1 performance, ROP's FFY 2017 performance shall be considered baseline. As described in the FFY 2017 Data page of this Indicator, ROP's FFY 2017 baseline was 70% (7/10).

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

With input from the ROP Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's key stakeholder group, ROP's FFY 2018 target was changed from 60% to 70.1%. This change in percentage represents an increase from the FFY 2017 baseline percentage.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	null	7
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	null	10
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>		Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

Based on the required actions from OSEP's response to ROP's FFY 2016 APR, ROP was required to change its method for calculating graduation rates when reporting data under Indicator 1 to ensure a more accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEPs. For this indicator, ROP chose to report graduation rates using Option 2 which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA. As such, ROP reported a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

denominator.

Using the one-year data lag requirement for Indicator 1, ROP used the IDEA 618 Exit Data for school year 2016-2017 submitted in November 2017 for reporting FFY 2017 performance data. There was a total of 11 exiters reported in the ROP 2016-2017 IDEA 618 Exit Data; of which, one student with an IEP who dropped out was from an elementary school. Because Indicator 1 measures high school exiters (ages 14-21), ROP's total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school is 10, with 7 of these exiters graduating with a high school diploma.

ROP reports graduation rate at 70% (7/10) for FFY 2017 Indicator 1. Based on the new required calculation from OSEP, the data reported for FFY 2017 will be considered baseline data.

### FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
7	10	33.33%		70.00%

### 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.

As described in the Explanation of Alternate Data section, ROP was required to change its methodology for calculating graduation rates. ROP chose to report graduation rates using Option 2 which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

Because ROP is not required to report a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, ROP may use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009). Therefore, ROP must calculate its graduation rate using one of the following two options when reporting data under Indicator 1 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, due on February 1, 2019, and subsequent SPP/APRs:

1) ROP may report a four year adjusted cohort rate required under the ESEA. The definition of adjusted four-year cohort graduation rate data for the purposes of submitting data files to ED Facts is "the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class." From the beginning of 9th grade (or the earliest high school grade), students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is "adjusted" by adding any students who subsequently transfer into the cohort and subtracting any students who subsequently transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die. For example for 2016-2017, the numerator is the number of cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the 2016-2017 and the denominator is the number of first-time 9th graders in fall 2013 (starting cohort) plus students who transferred in, minus students who transferred out, emigrated, or died during school years 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17; or

2) ROP may use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009). If ROP chooses this option, ROP must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator. For example, for 2016-2017, the percentage must be calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the exit reason category graduated with a regular high school diploma by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died), then multiplying the result by 100.

ROP must use one of the two options provided above in its FFY 2017 SPP/APR and subsequent submissions to ensure that it is providing a more accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEPs. ROP may also include, in addition to one of the two options, ROP's current method of calculating its graduation rate. Please note that OSEP will use only one of the two options for the purposes of OSEP's SPP/APR review and response process.

OSEP suggests that ROP work with the IDEA Data Center, or another OSEP-funded National Technical Assistance Provider for additional guidance.

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response

Based on the required actions from OSEP's response to ROP's FFY 2016 APR, ROP was required to change its method of calculating graduation rates when reporting data in FFY 2017 for Indicator 1 to ensure a more accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEPs. For this indicator, ROP chooses to report graduation rates using Option 2 which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA. As such, data reported for FFY 2017 will be considered baseline data based on the new required calculation from OSEP.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			17.00%	14.00%	10.00%	10.00%	7.00%	5.00%	5.00%	10.00%	10.00%
Data		8.00%	12.00%	16.00%	18.00%	18.00%	10.00%	12.00%	20.00%	6.67%	5.88%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	7.00%	7.00%
Data	8.57%	3.33%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

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? No

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
2	27	3.33%	2.00%	7.41%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), ROP does not report drop-out data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA.

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 2016-2017, there were three youth with an IEP who dropped out; of which, two youth with an IEP were enrolled in high school and one was in elementary school. FFY 2017 Indicator 2 reported data therefore included two youth with IEP who dropped out of high school in school year 2016-2017 and a total of 27 high school enrolled youth with IEPs in the same year. 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 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

As mentioned earlier, ROP continues to choose Option 2 to report drop-out rates for Indicator 2. Consistent with ROP's FFY 2010 measurement, the data sources used are those who dropped out of high school and those youth with IEPs enrolled in high school.

**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?** No

**Reasons for Slippage**

Based on the IDEA 618 Exit Data from 2016-2017 used for FFY 2017 Indicator 2, ROP reported a total of 3 students with IEPs who dropped out: 2 of the dropouts were from high school and 1 was from elementary school. There were 27 students with IEPs enrolled in high school in school year 2016-2017. For this FFY 2017 Indicator 2 data, ROP reports an increase of 1 dropout and a decrease of 3 enrolled students with IEPs when compared to the previous year. The ratio of dropouts to enrollment leaves ROP with a dropout rate of 7.41% (2/27) for FFY 2017. As such, ROP did not meet its target of 2% and had slippage from the previous year's dropout rate of 3.33% (1/30). Due to ROP's small "n" size, it is important to consider that the ratio may fluctuate considerably when the number changes by 1.

Although ROP's reported number of drop-outs is small, reasons for the increase in drop-outs could be attributed to chronic absences and location of ROP's only public high school. One of the students who dropped out is from an outer-island state who has to live with relatives to be able to attend ROP's only public high school located in Koror. The student was able to start high school for a couple of years but due to difficulties with the living situation, the student dropped out and returned to his/her outer-island state. Various efforts continue to be made to prevent students from dropping out. Not only do schools partner with parents, they work with various youth organizations and local agencies to support students and families, including those students who are from outer-island states who are not able to set-up living arrangements in Koror where the public high school is located.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			82.00%	85.00%	88.00%	90.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	80.00%	80.00%
			Data		85.00%	90.00%	91.00%	100%	95.70%	100%	88.10%	92.00%	85.37%	79.49%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			82.00%	85.00%	88.00%	90.00%	93.00%	94.00%	95.00%	80.00%	80.00%
			Data		85.00%	86.00%	91.00%	100%	100%	100%	76.20%	95.00%	82.93%	76.92%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
		Data	96.77%	94.29%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%
		Data	96.77%	94.29%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall		95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall		95.00%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

ROP is re-establishing baseline in FFY 2017 due to the implementation of a new general education assessment, the Iowa Assessments, beginning Spring 2018. The Iowa Assessments, a University of Iowa Testing Program, is a standardized norm referenced achievement test administered to grades 3-11. ROP's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS) continues to be the portfolio assessment system. The previous reporting years included general education assessment participation and proficiency data from the Palau Achievement Test (PAT) and ROP's AA-AAS portfolio assessment system, administered to grades 4, 6, 8, and high school.

With input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's key stakeholder group, ROP will maintain its target of 95% for FFY 2018.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	49	36	94.29%		73.47%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	49	32	94.29%		65.31%

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Public Reporting Information**

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

Public Reporting Requirement for Assessment Data. As instructed, ROP is required to provide the URL (electronic link) to the location where ROP publicly reports on assessments for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled students, pursuant to 34 CFR 300.160. ROP reports that MOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. ROP provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR, which is posted on the MOE website under Special Education: [www.palaumoe.net](http://www.palaumoe.net) (Click "Ministry," then select "Special Education").

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

ROP is re-establishing baseline in FFY 2017 due to the implementation of a new general education assessment, the Iowa Assessments, beginning Spring 2018. The Iowa Assessments, a University of Iowa Testing Program, is a standardized norm referenced achievement test administered to grades 3-11. ROP's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS) continues to be the portfolio assessment system. The previous reporting years included general education assessment participation and proficiency data from the Palau Achievement Test (PAT) and ROP's AA-AAS portfolio assessment system, administered to grades 4, 6, 8, and high school.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

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))

## Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2007	Target ≥				30.00%	30.00%	41.00%	43.00%	43.00%	43.00%	15.00%	15.00%
			Data		3.00%	23.00%	37.00%	76.10%	12.50%	19.60%	13.50%	32.40%	17.14%	22.58%
Math	A Overall	2007	Target ≥				24.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%	28.00%	28.00%	10.00%	10.00%
			Data		3.00%	15.00%	22.00%	30.90%	12.50%	17.40%	18.80%	17.10%	11.76%	26.67%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	25.00%	35.00%
		Data	26.67%	30.30%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	20.00%	30.00%
		Data	26.67%	18.18%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

## FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall		35.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall		35.00%

Key:

## Explanation of Changes

ROP is re-establishing baseline in FFY 2017 due to the implementation of a new general education assessment, the Iowa Assessments, beginning Spring 2018. The Iowa Assessments, a University of Iowa Testing Program, is a standardized norm referenced achievement test administered to grades 3-11. ROP's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS) continues to be the portfolio assessment system. The previous reporting years included general education assessment participation and proficiency data from the Palau Achievement Test (PAT) and ROP's AA-AAS portfolio assessment system, administered to grades 4, 6, 8, and high school.

With input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's key stakeholder group, ROP changed its FFY 2018 target to 35% for both reading and math. This change represents an increase from ROP's FFY 2018 baseline data.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

## FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	36	11	30.30%		30.56%

## FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	a proficiency was assigned				
A Overall	32	11	18.18%		34.38%

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Public Reporting Requirement for Assessment Data. As instructed, ROP is required to provide the URL (electronic link) to the location where ROP publicly reports on assessments for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled students, pursuant to 34 CFR 300.160. ROP reports that MOE does not publicly report assessment data for nondisabled students. ROP provides participation and performance data of students with disabilities through the APR, which is posted on the MOE website under Special Education: [www.palaumoe.net](http://www.palaumoe.net) (Click "Ministry," then select "Special Education").

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

ROP is re-establishing baseline in FFY 2017 due to the implementation of a new general education assessment, the Iowa Assessments, beginning Spring 2018. The Iowa Assessments, a University of Iowa Testing Program, is a standardized norm referenced achievement test administered to grades 3-11. ROP's alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS) continues to be the portfolio assessment system. The previous reporting years included general education assessment participation and proficiency data from the Palau Achievement Test (PAT) and ROP's AA-AAS portfolio assessment system, administered to grades 4, 6, 8, and high school.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

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; and
- 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	0%	0%
Data	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	1	100%	0%	0%

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

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

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

**Definition of "significant discrepancy":** 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 2017 reported data represent the one-year data lag requirement with the relative difference calculated as follows using data from 2016-2017:

**0% (0/92=students with disabilities) – 0% (0/2225=students without disabilities) = 0% Relative Difference**

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

The failure to conduct the review required in 34 CFR §300.170(b) is noncompliance. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must report correction of this noncompliance by describing the review and, if appropriate, revision of 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 these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA.

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 response, **not including correction of findings**

In FFY 2016, ROP reported a significant discrepancy between the long-term suspension/expulsion rates of students with an IEP and students without an IEP. ROP also reported that it 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 they contributed to the significant discrepancy reported for Indicator 4A in FFY 2016. Based on the review, ROP determined that the significant discrepancy is not due to ROP's policies, procedures, and practices. ROP did not identify 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.

A consideration when determining ROP's relative difference between special education and general education is the small "n" size of ROP's students with an IEP. In FFY 2016, ROP reported 2 long-term suspension/expulsion of students with an IEP compared to 23 long-term suspension/expulsion of students without an IEP. However, because the overall number of students with an IEP was 91, the percentage of students with an IEP was a higher percentage compared to the data from students without an IEP that used a total enrollment of 2,269.

### FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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 2017, ROP reported no significant discrepancy between the long-term suspension/expulsion rates of students with an IEP and students without an IEP.

In FFY 2016, ROP reported significant discrepancy between the long-term suspension/expulsion rates of students with an IEP and students without an IEP. ROP also reported that it 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 they contributed to the significant discrepancy reported for Indicator 4A in FFY 2016. Based on the review, ROP determined that the significant discrepancy is not due to ROP's policies, procedures, and practices. ROP did not identify 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)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

**Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable**

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

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Compliance 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; and
- 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))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance**

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	50.00%	55.00%
		Data		18.00%	21.00%	31.00%	34.00%	40.00%	34.00%	41.00%	55.00%	61.86%	58.00%
B	2005	Target ≤			14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	13.00%	13.00%	13.00%	13.00%	13.00%	12.00%
		Data		19.00%	20.00%	12.00%	12.00%	15.00%	17.00%	12.00%	7.00%	8.25%	9.00%
C	2005	Target ≤			5.00%	4.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
		Data		3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	3.00%	0.80%	0%	0%	1.00%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	55.00%	57.00%
	Data	58.24%	63.95%
B	Target ≤	12.00%	12.00%
	Data	13.19%	17.44%
C	Target ≤	2.00%	2.00%
	Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	60.00%	62.00%
Target B ≤	11.00%	11.00%
Target C ≤	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	71	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	42	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	12	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	null	null

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	n	null

### FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	42	71	63.95%	60.00%	59.15%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12	71	17.44%	11.00%	16.90%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	71	0%	2.00%	0%

### Reasons for A Slippage

ROP did not meet its 5A target of 60% by 0.85%, with its FFY 2017 data of 59.15% (42/71). ROP's FFY 2017 5A performance represented slippage from the previous year's performance of 63.95% (55/86). The decrease in percentage represented a decrease by 13 students with an IEP in the regular class for 80% or more of the day. These 13 students included those who exited the program to regular education no longer needing special education services, graduates with a high school diploma, and those who dropped out from school. In addition, two of these students continued to receive special education services, but based on the IEP team decision, required more time in the special education resource room under the 40-79% LRE category instead of the 80% or more LRE category.

It is understood that the LRE provision is based on the individual student needs. The school, in collaboration with the Special Education Program, continues to provide support to general education and special education teachers on strategies/approaches for including students with an IEP in the general education classroom as much as appropriate.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									100%	80.00%	80.00%
		Data								100%	89.00%	85.71%	100%
B	2011	Target ≤									0%	2.00%	2.00%
		Data								0%	0%	0%	0%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	83.00%	83.00%
	Data	100%	100%
B	Target ≤	1.00%	1.00%
	Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	86.00%	100%
Target B ≤	0%	0%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">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</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	null	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early	2	3	100%	86.00%	66.67%

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	3	0%	0%	0%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Reasons for A Slippage**

Based on the IEP, one preschooler with a disability required home services and two preschoolers with a disability received special education and related services in a regular early childhood program. The FFY 2017 6A performance was therefore 66.67% (2/3) because one of the three preschoolers was receiving special education and related services in the home due to medical reasons.

It is understood that where preschoolers with disabilities receive special education and related services is based on their individual needs as determined by the IEP team.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%	100%	85.00%	85.00%
		Data					100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
A2	2008	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%	100%	60.00%	60.00%
		Data					100%	100%	80.00%	100%	67.00%	100%	75.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%	100%	70.00%	70.00%
		Data					100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75.00%	75.00%
B2	2008	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%	100%	49.00%	50.00%
		Data					100%	67.00%	80.00%	100%	67.00%	50.00%	50.00%
C1	2008	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%	100%	60.00%	62.00%
		Data					100%	100%	66.70%	0%	100%	100%	100%
C2	2008	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%	100%	60.00%	62.00%
		Data					100%	67.00%	60.00%	100%	67.00%	75.00%	75.00%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	85.00%	90.00%
	Data	100%	100%
A2	Target ≥	62.00%	62.50%
	Data	40.00%	33.33%
B1	Target ≥	72.00%	73.00%
	Data	100%	100%
B2	Target ≥	51.00%	52.00%
	Data	20.00%	33.33%
C1	Target ≥	64.00%	66.00%
	Data	100%	100%
C2	Target ≥	64.00%	66.00%
	Data	40.00%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	95.00%	100%
Target A2 ≥	63.00%	100%
Target B1 ≥	74.00%	100%
Target B2 ≥	53.00%	100%
Target C1 ≥	68.00%	100%
Target C2 ≥	67.00%	100%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	null
--	------

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	0.00	0.00	100%	95.00%	
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	0.00	0.00	33.33%	63.00%	

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

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	0.00	0.00	100%	74.00%	
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	0.00	0.00	33.33%	53.00%	

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

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	0.00	0.00	100%	68.00%	
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	0.00	0.00	100%	67.00%	

**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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? 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)

ROP does not have FFY 2017 data to report for Indicator 7. There were three preschoolers with disabilities who exited the program at the end of the reporting year but did not receive preschool special education and related services for six months, as required by ROP's ECO measurement system. These three preschoolers with disabilities were identified in January 2018 and transitioned to 1st grade by the end of the reporting period, which resulted in less than six months of preschool special education and related services.

It should be noted that the three preschoolers with disabilities accounted for in the December 1, 2017 IDEA Child Count and Environments data, as reflected in Indicator 6, continue to receive special education preschool services.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? Yes

Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? Yes

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Preschool	2005	Target ≥			88.00%	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	88.00%
		Data		88.00%	93.75%	90.00%	88.20%	88.90%	87.50%	62.96%	100%	95.24%
School Age	2005	Target ≥			45.65%	38.85%	41.71%	44.56%	47.41%	47.41%	47.41%	97.00%
		Data		43.00%	36.00%	44.00%	39.00%	56.00%	43.00%	44.00%	42.00%	97.47%

	FFY	2014	2015	2016
Preschool	Target ≥	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%
	Data	100%	100%	85.71%
School Age	Target ≥	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%
	Data	91.57%	93.42%	90.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Preschool Target ≥	92.00%	93.00%
School-age Target ≥	99.00%	99.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
Preschool	6	6	85.71%	92.00%	100%
School-age	61	63	90.00%	99.00%	96.83%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	93.24%	74.00
---	--------	-------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? 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

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

### **PRESCHOOL (3-5)**

Data on Early Childhood Family Outcomes were collected using the Belau Preschool Family Outcome Survey, as in previous years. Surveys were distributed to all six parents of preschool children (ages 3-5) receiving services during 2017-2018 school year. All six surveys were returned to the Early Childhood Special Education Program (100% return rate), which represents the demographics of ROP for preschoolers with an IEP.

Calculation Good to Excellent. Parents who gave ratings of 5, 6 or 7 on the 7 point scale are considered to be responding that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Averaging the number of items across the total number of responses of 5, 6, or 7 gives the following results:

- a. Total number of item response = 18
- b. Total number of responses indicating good to excellent = 18

**Calculation –  $b/a (18/18) \times 100 = 100\%$  or all six families who completed the survey.**

### **Data Collection Method**

#### Preschool Family Outcome Survey

This survey was conducted with support from the Belau Head Start Program to reach parents of children with disabilities (ages 3-5) enrolled in Head Start Centers and those who were receiving home services. Head Start Family Service Workers distributed and collected surveys from parents of their respective centers and other settings under the supervision of the Head Start Disability Service personnel who submitted the completed surveys back to the Early Childhood Special Education Program.

Surveys were numbered and placed in envelopes so that parents would feel comfortable completing it and to ensure that the surveys remained anonymous. Six surveys were distributed and collected from parents of children (ages 3-5) receiving services during the 2017-2018 school year.

### **ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY (6-21)**

The analysis of the completed parent surveys involved adding the scores for each item for each individual survey and determining the mean. The individual surveys that had a mean of 3.0 and above were considered to have met that standard that the schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. This resulted in 96.83% (61/63) of the parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

#### **Part B Elementary and Secondary Special Education Survey Report for FFY 2017:**

#### **ROP RESULTS**

ALL PART B (STANDARD METHOD) FFY 2017

Percent at or above Indicator 8 standard of a rating of 3.0 and above: 61/63= **96.83%**

Number of Valid Responses: 63

Mean Measure: 3.00 Measurement Standard Deviation .52

### **Data Collection Method**

#### Elementary and Secondary Survey

In April 2018, 68 surveys were distributed to parents of elementary and secondary students with an IEP. Sixty-Three (63) surveys were collected and provided to Guam CEDDERS for analysis. Of the 68 parents of students aged 6-21 that were provided a survey, 63 surveys were returned for a response rate of 92.65% (63/68), which represented a slight decrease by 3.74% from 96.39% (80/83) in FFY 2016.

#### Elementary and Secondary Representation of Respondents:

Grade level: 73.02% (46/63) = Elementary; 26.98% (17/63) = High School

Race/Ethnicity: Palauan = 100% (63/63)

#### Comments included in the individual completed surveys

The parent survey analysis involved recording the comments from the surveys. There was a total of seven responses; of which, two were written in Palauan. The comments were categorized by the following themes: Satisfaction with services (3); Supports for school personnel (2); Least Restrictive Environment (1); and Parent participation (1).

ROP reports that the respondents are representative of the school-age students with an IEP. In reviewing the surveys returned, the data

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

summary represents all public elementary and high schools. As expected, with the majority of surveys returned from the elementary schools, all ages were represented in the results.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

**Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable**

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

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

**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))**

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

**Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable**

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

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

**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))**

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		67.00%	67.00%	85.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
18	17	100%	100%	94.44%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1
---	---

**Reasons for Slippage**

For Indicator 11, ROP reported slippage from 100% (12/12) compliance in FFY 2016 to 94.44% (17/18) compliance in FFY 2017. ROP's FFY 2017 performance represented one initial evaluation not completed within the 60-day timeline. The reason for the slippage was attributed to a program delay. The initial evaluation was completed, but it was completed five days over the 60-day timeline. The program delay was due to an oversight of the date required to meet the 60-day timeline.

Because the reason is a program delay, noncompliance was identified and the timely correction of the noncompliance, consistent with OSEP 09-02, will be reported in the next reporting year for Indicator 11.

**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.**

In FFY 2017, ROP reported one initial evaluation completed over the 60-day timeline. This initial evaluation was completed five days over the 60-day timeline. As described under the Reasons for Slippage section of this Indicator, the reason for delay was due to a program delay attributed to personnel oversight of the dates and timeline.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

**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, 2017-June 30, 2018. 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.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

**Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable**

Per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 12 is not applicable to ROP. ROP does not receive Part C funding under IDEA.

*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))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						98.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
17	17	100%	100%	100%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source: The secondary transition data was taken from the database system of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition for the report year July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018. This database was established specifically for tracking the timeline requirement for Indicator 13 within the Special Education Data System (SEDS).

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

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

4/15/2019

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							11.00%	11.00%	11.25%	25.00%	30.00%
		Data						11.00%	20.00%	31.00%	31.00%	33.33%	14.29%
B	2009	Target ≥							56.00%	56.00%	56.25%	50.00%	51.00%
		Data						56.00%	80.00%	77.00%	62.00%	50.00%	57.14%
C	2009	Target ≥							100%	100%	100%	70.00%	75.00%
		Data						100%	100%	85.00%	77.00%	100%	85.71%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	35.00%	40.00%
	Data	16.67%	40.00%
B	Target ≥	52.00%	53.00%
	Data	33.33%	60.00%
C	Target ≥	80.00%	85.00%
	Data	83.33%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	45.00%	50.00%
Target B ≥	54.00%	60.00%
Target C ≥	90.00%	100%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 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	10.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	4.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	0.00
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).	1.00

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	4.00	10.00	40.00%	45.00%	40.00%

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6.00	10.00	60.00%	54.00%	60.00%
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)	7.00	10.00	100%	90.00%	70.00%

**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.

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

**Reasons for C Slippage**

ROP did not meet its target of 90% for indicator 14C, reporting outcomes at 70% (7/10) which is a slippage from FFY 2016 outcomes of 100% (5/5). Due to ROP's small "n" size, it is important to consider that the ratio may fluctuate considerably if the numbers change by 1. Despite the slippage from year to year, ROP reported an increase of 2 students engaged in some kind of education program or employment this FFY 2017 compared to FFY 2016.

The slippage reported for 14C from 100% (5/5) in FFY 2016 to 70% (7/10) in FFY 2017 was due to three leavers considered "not engaged." The reasons for the three leavers not engaging in post-secondary activities included starting a post-education program but not completing a term due to the family situation, wanting to take a break from school for a year, and needing additional supports in basic daily living skills at home.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

**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.**

ROP's Indicator 14 response rate in FFY 2017 was 100% (10/10), which is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had an IEP in effect at the time they left high school. ROP reported a total of 11 exiters in the 2016-2017 IDEA 618 exit report; of which, 10 exiters were from high school and one from elementary school. The 10 high school exiters (7 graduates with a high school diploma, 1 who received a certificate, and 2 who dropped out) were identified as leavers for Indicator 14 and all responded to the Indicator 14 survey.

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

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data		

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data		

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		32.00%	42.00%	52.00%	67.00%
Data	0%	0%	25.00%	100%	61.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target ≥	82.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

See attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report for measure description.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Overview**

See attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report.

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Refer to Component #1, pages 4-8, in the attached complete SSIP.

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Refer to Component #2, pages 9-16, in the attached complete SSIP.

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Statement

Refer to Component #3, pages 17-19, in the attached complete SSIP.

Description

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Refer to Component #4, pages 20-22, in the attached complete SSIP.

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Refer to Component #5, pages 23-24, in the attached complete SSIP.

### Infrastructure Development

- Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Refer to Component #1: Infrastructure Development in the attached ROP SSIP Phase II.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Refer to Component #2: Implementation of EBPs in the attached ROP SSIP Phase II.

### Evaluation

- Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Refer to Component #3: Evaluation in the attached ROP SSIP Phase II.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

**Phase II Technical Assistance and Support:**

4/15/2019

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The development of Phase II of ROP's SSIP was made possible with support and technical assistance from OSEP and OSEP-funded National Technical Assistance (TA) Centers (IDC, DaSy, ECTA Center, NCSI), participation in the Language & Literacy Cross-Entity Learning Collaborative meetings and the Pacific Entity Collaborative meetings. ROP accessed numerous resources available on the TA center websites, face-to-face meetings, conference calls, and facilitated work sessions. In addition, ROP received technical assistance from University of Guam CEDDERS for the development of Phase II.

ROP will continue to access and request TA in the areas needed to ensure the improvement activities will lead to improvements in the SIMRs.

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Refer to attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report.

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Refer to attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report.

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Refer to attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report.

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Refer to attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report.

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets

Refer to attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report.

### F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Refer to attached ROP SSIP Phase III Year Three Report.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

**Selected:** 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: Acting Special Education Coordinator

Email: norarenguul@palaumoe.net

Phone: 680-488-2568