

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of the Republic of Palau (ROP) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2018. 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 2018 APR.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, ROP reports FFY 2018 data to determine if ROP met its FFY 2018 target, provides an explanation of slippage if ROP did not meet its target, and responds to any issue identified for the Indicator in the June 20, 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter and ROP's FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

As required, for Indicator 17, ROP's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), ROP will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year Four Report no later than April 1, 2020. Per OSEP's guidance, ROP's SSIP Phase III-Year Four Report will provide data and analysis, consistent with its evaluation plan, on the extent to which ROP has made progress towards or has met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes for implementation of its SSIP and has made progress in achieving ROP's State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) for children with disabilities.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System

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

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary education system that includes 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.

Technical Assistance System

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

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary system that provides timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to schools. The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI) is responsible for developing appropriate curricula with instructional materials for all public schools and providing training and support to school personnel for ensuring the educational programs result in successful students in Palauan society and the world. The BCI includes content, assessment, and training specialists who provide the technical assistance, training, and support to school personnel, including special education teachers. 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 meetings as needed to discuss the status of all improvement activities and what can be done to support indicator cluster teams carry out specific SPP indicator activities, which include collaborating with the BCI content, assessment, and training specialists to implement training activities with parents, principals, teachers, and related service providers at different times of the year. All technical assistance and support to the schools are coordinated as a system.

The Head Start Program, administered through the Palau Community Action Agency, serves as the primary educational setting for preschoolers with disabilities. ROP MOE has general supervision oversight, including monitoring, of the special education and related services provided for preschoolers with disabilities within the Head Start Program. ROP MOE Special Education Program collaborates with the Head Start Program to provide technical assistance and support to the Head Start Center teachers, staff, and parents. The Special Education Program also provides parent workshops focused on parent rights, state complaints, parent roles and responsibilities in the special education process, and other topical areas. The parent workshops are

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

Professional Development System

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

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

The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI) facilitates the training and support to school personnel for ensuring the educational programs result in successful students in Palauan society and the world. The BCI includes content, assessment, and training specialists who provide the technical assistance, training, and support to school personnel, including special education teachers. 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.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

The Republic of Palau (ROP) Ministry of Education (MOE), Special Education Program (SPED) facilitates stakeholder involvement for the development of ROP's Part B State Performance Plan (SPP), inclusive of the development and implementation of Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and ROP's FFY 2018 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 2013-2019 SPP, FFY 2018 APR, and the development of ROP's SPP: SSIP Indicator 17 included the following:

Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC):

SEAC met in January 2020 to review ROP's FFY 2018 APR performance data, trend data, reasons for slippage where applicable, and to provide input on reasons for slippage and FFY 2019 APR targets for APR results indicators.

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

As scheduled, the Special Education Coordinator presented on the importance of collaborative efforts, commitments, and involvement of key personnel from management to the school level in ensuring that IDEA requirements are met and children with disabilities get the services and supports to meet their needs. The presentations included a review of the special education child count trend data that relate to the Child Find procedures and information on some progress to acknowledge the efforts and contributions of key personnel involved.

SSIP Core Team:

The ROP SSIP Core team met at least monthly to review ROP's SSIP implementation progress, FFY 2018 State-Identified Measurable Results (SIMR) results, and implementation of evaluation measures. The meetings included updates to the calendar of activities to ensure progress toward meeting the SIMRs.

Other Activities Related to Stakeholders:

Public Awareness:

To increase awareness of the special education program, the Special Education Coordinator participated in the four monthly radio talk shows sponsored by nonprofit organizations for individuals with disabilities.

Special Education Coordinator was appointed by the Ministry of Education to become a member of the Pacific Inclusive Education Framework Steering Committee for the revision of the Pacific Regional Inclusive Education Framework.

Special Education Coordinator attended a monthly Children with Special Needs (CSN) Committee meeting sponsored by the Ministry of Health (MOH) which comprise of representatives from partner agencies including MOH, Head Start, Palau Parent Empowered (non-profit organization of parents of children with disabilities) and special education key personnel. The Coordinator was invited to clarify special education policies and procedures relating to referrals for special education services.

Special Education Coordinator and key personnel joined a meeting with the CSN Committee for planning and scheduling of technical assistance activities provided by a Speech Pathologist brought to Palau by MOH.

Special Education staff participated in a parade and Family Day Picnic to celebrate the Disability Week, as well as the training on the Convention of the Rights of Individuals with Disabilities.

SSIP Implementation:

MOE Management Team and SSIP Core Team members participated in the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) meetings in June 2019 and December 2019. These meetings provided an opportunity for the team members to gather relevant information to further their SSIP implementation, with an emphasis on ROP's SSIP scale-up priorities.

ROP SSIP team, which included a SEAC parent representative and a SSIP target school parent representative, participated in the Pacific SSIP Collaborative in October 2019 held on Guam. This regional engagement provided planning opportunities for the ROP SSIP team to discuss how the information and resources shared can apply to ROP's SSIP implementation. It also provided the parent representatives an opportunity to learn about and contribute to the priorities for the ROP SSIP implementation.

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

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, Palau must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, Palau must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, Palau must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since Palau's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting Palau's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

ROP's Response to FFY 2017 APR Required Actions: Per OSEP's instruction, for Indicator 17, ROP's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), ROP will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year Four Report no later than April 1, 2020, which will include ROP's FFY 2018 SSIP SiMR data and progress toward implementing its SSIP.

2019 Determination Letter: The Department determined that Palau needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of IDEA. The Department identifies a State or Entity as needing intervention under IDEA Part B if its RDA Percentage is less than 60%. Palau's RDA Percentage for its FFY 2017 APR was 52.5%. OSEP indicated that it will continue the Specific Condition on the Palau's FFY 2019 IDEA Part B grant award related to ensuring that policies and procedures meet the requirements governing qualifications for special education teachers in section 612(a)(14)(C) of IDEA and 34 CFR §300.156(c). The specific reporting requirements and other required actions was described in OSEP's FFY 2019 IDEA Part B grant award documents.

ROP's Response to 2019 Determination Letter: As required in ROP's FFY 2019 IDEA Part B Grant Award Enclosure C: Specific Condition, on October 30, 2019, ROP provided its revised draft Teacher Certification policy to the OSEP State Lead.

Intro - OSEP Response

Republic of Palau (ROP) were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. Palau provided the required information. Palau provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

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

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2017	70.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	14.00%	30.00%	30.00%	40.00%	
Data	14.29%	25.00%	33.33%	33.33%	70.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	70.10%	70.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

In FFY 2017, OSEP required ROP to change its methodology for calculating graduation rates. Effective FFY 2017, ROP uses data from the IDEA 618 exit report for calculating graduation rates for Indicator 1. Baseline data for Indicator 1 was therefore re-established in FFY 2017, with stakeholders providing input for the FFY 2018 Indicator 1 target. In this FFY 2018 APR, stakeholders provided input for the FFY 2019 Indicator 1 target.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	6
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	16.67%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	6	70.00%	70.10%	16.67%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

ROP reports a graduation rate of 16.67% (1/6) for Indicator 1 this FFY 2018. ROP reports a decrease of six students with IEPs graduating with a high school diploma when compared to the previous year. As such, ROP did not meet its target of 70.10% and reported slippage from the previous year's graduation rate of 70.00%. Due to ROP's small "n" size, it is important to consider that the ratio may fluctuate considerably if the numbers change by 1.

Reasons for the slippage in graduation rate for students with IEPs included exiters dropping out of school or remaining in the same grade (retention) due to required credit accruals to move on to the next grade. The high school continues to make efforts in ensuring that students are working towards achieving 27 credits of required courses and electives to graduate with a regular diploma. Secondary special education teachers and general education teachers continue to communicate periodically to monitor student's progress and ensure success in the regular setting. Local youth programs continue to offer interventions and supports for students with or without IEPs who drop out or were suspended, expelled, or truant, with one of the outcomes being for these youth to return to school.

Graduation Conditions

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

Other

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ROP reports Indicator 1 graduation rates using the 618 exit data. Following the one-year data lag reporting for Indicator 1, ROP used its 2017-2018 reported 618 data for reporting FFY 2018 performance data. In 2017-2018, ROP reported seven students with IEPs who left school in the 618 exit data report: Six of the exiters were from high school and 1 exiter was from elementary school. In ROP, elementary school includes grades 1-8. Following the measurement, the FFY 2018 data for Indicator 1 includes only those exiters from high school, which was a total of six exiters: one who graduated with a high school diploma; four who dropped out; and one who died.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

ROP provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	18.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	7.00%	7.00%	2.00%
Data	6.67%	5.88%	8.57%	3.33%	7.41%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	0
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	0
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	5
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	1

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

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

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

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

With stakeholder input, ROP continues to choose Option 2 to report drop-out rates for Indicator 2. ROP uses the high school enrollment and reported IDEA 618 Exit data to calculate drop out rate following the one-year lag data requirement. In school year 2017-2018, there were five youth with an IEP who dropped out; of which, four youth with an IEP were enrolled in high school and one was in elementary school. FFY 2018 Indicator 2 reported data therefore included four youth with IEP who dropped out of high school in school year 2017-2018 and a total of 22 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 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4	22	7.41%	2.00%	18.18%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

ROP reports a dropout rate of 18.18% (4/22) for Indicator 2. ROP reports an increase of two high school dropouts and a decrease of five enrolled high school students with IEPs when compared to the previous year. As such, ROP did not meet its target of 2% and reported slippage from the previous year's dropout rate of 7.41% (2/27). Due to ROP's small "n" size, it is important to consider that the ratio may fluctuate considerably if the numbers change by 1.

Of the four students who dropped out of high school, one student dropped out to participate in alternative education, one student dropped out because of issues with chronic absences, one student dropped out due to early parenthood, and one student dropped out due to issues with living situations pertaining to several transfers of guardianship. Various efforts were made to prevent these students from dropping out.

To prevent students from dropping out, school administrators, teachers, and parents discussed intervention strategies for students with IEPs requesting to withdrawing from school with no intention of attending another school. The schools continue to make home visits for students with IEPs who are truant. Local youth programs continued to offer interventions and supports for students with or without IEPs who drop out or were truant, with one of the outcomes being returning to 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? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

ROP provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

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

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	
A	Overall	73.47%	Actual	85.37%	79.49%	96.77%	94.29%	73.47%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	
A	Overall	65.31%	Actual	82.93%	76.92%	96.77%	94.29%	65.31%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

In FFY 2017, ROP re-established its baseline for Indicator 3 because of the implementation of a new state-wide assessment. In FFY 2017, ROP stakeholders provided input to setting ROP's FFY 2018 target for Indicator 3, and in FFY 2018, ROP stakeholders provided input to setting ROP's FFY 2019 target for Indicator 3.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	13	10	6	4	8	6					9
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0	0	0	0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12	6	4	3	7	4					6
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	0	1	2	0	0	2					1

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	13	10	6	4	8	6					9
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0	0	0	0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12	6	4	4	7	4					6
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	0	1	2	0	0	2					1

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	56	48	73.47%	95.00%	85.71%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	56	49	65.31%	95.00%	87.50%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

As instructed, ROP is required to provide the URL (electronic link) to the location where ROP publicly reports on assessments for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled students, pursuant to 34 CFR 300.160. ROP reports 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 (Click "Ministry," then select "Special Education").

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

ROP provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

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

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	15.00%	15.00%	25.00%	35.00%	
A	Overall	30.56%	Actual	17.14%	22.58%	26.67%	30.30%	30.56%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2017	Target >=	10.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	
A	Overall	34.38%	Actual	11.76%	26.67%	26.67%	18.18%	34.38%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	35.00%	35.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	35.00%	35.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

In FFY 2017, ROP re-established its baseline for Indicator 3 because of the implementation of a new state-wide assessment. In FFY 2017, ROP stakeholders provided input to setting ROP's FFY 2018 target for Indicator 3, and in FFY 2018, ROP stakeholders provided input to setting ROP's FFY 2019 target for Indicator 3.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	12	7	5	3	7	6					7
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3	0	1	0	0	0					0
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	1	0	0	2					1

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	12	7	6	4	7	6					7
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6	0	2	0	0	0					2
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	1	0	0	1					1

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	47	8	30.56%	35.00%	17.02%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	ROP reported slippage for 3C in both reading and math. Stakeholders reviewed performance data from FFY 2017 and FFY 2018 given that Indicator 3 baseline data was re-established in FFY 2017 because of the implementation of a new state-wide assessment. Stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), discussed several improvements and issues related to the new state-wide assessment. With their input, reasons for slippage in ROP's 3C performance could be attributed to: (1) the need for additional teacher training on identifying and using appropriate accommodations in the classroom and for assessment, and using assessment results data for improving instruction. (2) possible issue with the alignment of curriculum and instruction with assessment. (3) the need to strengthen collaboration between general education and special education teachers and the supports provided for students with IEPs to access the general curriculum.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	49	13	34.38%	35.00%	26.53%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	ROP reported slippage for 3C in both reading and math. Stakeholders reviewed performance data from FFY 2017 and FFY 2018 given that Indicator 3 baseline data was re-established in FFY 2017 because of the implementation of a new state-wide assessment. Stakeholders, including the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), discussed several improvements and issues related to the new state-wide assessment. With their input, reasons for slippage in ROP's 3C performance could be attributed to: (1) the need for additional teacher training on identifying and using appropriate accommodations in the classroom and for assessment, and using assessment results data for improving instruction. (2) possible issue with the alignment of curriculum and instruction with assessment. (3) the need to strengthen collaboration between general education and special education teachers and the supports provided for students with IEPs to access the general curriculum.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ROP's correct FFY 2018 performance data for reading proficiency is 18.75% (9/48). ROP has submitted a correction to its 618 Assessment data specification file for reading proficiency. The submission error was in the total number of children with IEPs in 5th grade and the total number of children who scored proficient in the alternate assessment. As required by Part 618 Assessment File Specification, children with IEPs who are counted as participating children in ROP's state-wide assessment are children who have valid scores. The total number of children with IEPs in 5th grade therefore

should be 6 instead of 5, consistent with APR 3B participation data. In addition, the total number of children who scored proficient in the alternate assessment should be 2 instead of 1.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

ROP provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP notes that ROP reported it "resubmitted FS178 - Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts for school year 2018-2019 on April 17, 2020." The resubmission window for the assessment files closed on April 7, 2020; therefore, ROP's submission of EDFacts data (file spec FS178; Data Group: 584, and FS 175; Data Group 583) on December 6, 2019 are prepopulated in the reporting platform.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

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

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

This is calculated as follows:

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

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

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

FFY 2018 reported data represent the one-year data lag requirement with the relative difference calculated as follows using data from 2017-2018:

0% (0/74=students with disabilities) – 0.22% (5/2225=students without disabilities) = -0.22% Relative Difference.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 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.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

ROP provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	50.00%	55.00%	55.00%	57.00%	60.00%
A	18.00%	Data	61.86%	58.00%	58.24%	63.95%	59.15%
B	2005	Target <=	13.00%	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%	11.00%
B	19.00%	Data	8.25%	9.00%	13.19%	17.44%	16.90%
C	2005	Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
C	3.00%	Data	0.00%	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	62.00%	62.00%
Target B <=	11.00%	11.00%
Target C <=	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	80

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	48
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	0

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

NO

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	48	80	59.15%	62.00%	60.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11	80	16.90%	11.00%	13.75%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	0	80	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

ROP provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	83.00%	83.00%	86.00%
A	100.00%	Data	85.71%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%
B	2011	Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	1.00%	1.00%	0.00%
B	0.00%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	100.00%	100.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	1

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	0	1	66.67%	100.00%	0.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Based on the IDEA 618 LRE data report for FFY 2018, ROP served one preschooler with an IEP. The slippage reported for 6A was due to that one preschooler with an IEP receiving services in the home. Consistent with IDEA, LRE is an individual determination made by the IEP team based on the unique needs of the preschooler with a disability.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

ROP provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
A1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	

A2	2008	Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%
A2	100.00%	Data	100.00%	75.00%	40.00%	33.33%	
B1	2008	Target >=	70.00%	70.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%
B1	100.00%	Data	75.00%	75.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
B2	2008	Target >=	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%
B2	100.00%	Data	50.00%	50.00%	20.00%	33.33%	
C1	2008	Target >=	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%
C1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
C2	2008	Target >=	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	67.00%
C2	100.00%	Data	75.00%	75.00%	40.00%	100.00%	

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	100.00%	100.00%
Target A2 >=	100.00%	100.00%
Target B1 >=	100.00%	100.00%
Target B2 >=	100.00%	100.00%
Target C1 >=	100.00%	100.00%
Target C2 >=	100.00%	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

4

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4	100.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who	4	4		100.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	0	4		100.00%	0.00%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A

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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4	100.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4	4		100.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	0	4		100.00%	0.00%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	4	100.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	4	4		100.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	0	4		100.00%	0.00%	Did Not Meet Target	N/A

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

YES

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

ROP provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	2005	Target >=	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%
Preschool	88.00%	Data	95.24%	100.00%	100.00%	85.71%	100.00%
School age	2005	Target >=	97.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	99.00%
School age	43.00%	Data	97.47%	91.57%	93.42%	90.00%	96.83%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	93.00%	93.00%

Target B >=	99.00%	99.00%
-------------	--------	--------

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	5	7	100.00%	93.00%	71.43%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
School age	73	74	96.83%	99.00%	98.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage,if applicable

The preschool survey results reported slippage from 100% (6/6) in FFY 2017 to 71.43% (5/7) in FFY 2018. A possible reason for the slippage could be attributed to the limited time spent receiving services. The two parents who reported a low response had children with an IEP who were identified less than six months prior to their children completing preschool services.

The Early Childhood Education Specialist (also known as consulting resource teacher-CRT) continues to make efforts to reach out to parents via phone calls and home visits. In addition, the Early Childhood CRT continues to work with the Head Start Disabilities Coordinator to offer parent training to build their awareness of services. The Early Childhood CRT also collaborates with members of an inter-agency group working to serve children with disabilities. The inter-agency group members, such as pediatricians, psychiatrist, social worker, and the parent network director, offer parents assistance in connecting with and supporting parents of children with disabilities.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

85

Percentage of respondent parents

95.29%

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

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

In FFY 2018, the total number of surveys disseminated was 85; of which, seven surveys were for parents of preschoolers with an IEP and 78 surveys were for parents of school-age students with an IEP:

Preschool survey return rate = 100% (7/7)

School-Age survey return rate = 94.87% (74/78)

ROP reports that the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. All children with an IEP were accounted for in the dissemination of the parent survey. The return rate for preschoolers with an IEP was 100% (7/7); representative of all preschoolers with an IEP.

For school-age students with an IEP, the return rate was 94.87% (74/78). Four of the 78 surveys disseminated were not returned. ROP reviewed the ethnicity and school levels for determining representation.

Ethnicity: Overall, all 78 children with an IEP identify as Pacific islanders. For the 74 parents who completed the survey, 95.95% (71/74) indicated "Palauan" as their race/ethnic group, 2.70% (2/74) indicated "Other Pacific Islander," and 1.35% (1/74) did not indicate an ethnic group. The parent respondents were representative of the ethnicity of the children receiving special education services.

School Level: There were 60 parent surveys disseminated at the elementary schools; of which, 58 or 96.67% (58/60) were completed and returned. At the high school, 18 parent surveys were disseminated; of which, 16 or 88.87% (16/18) were completed and returned. The high percentages returned at both the elementary and high school levels indicate that the parent respondents were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

ROP provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	67.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	94.44%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
25	25	94.44%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source: The evaluation data was taken from the database system of all children for whom a parental consent to evaluate was received for the report year July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019. This database was established specifically for tracking the timeline requirement for Indicator 11 within the Special Education Data System (SEDS).

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1		0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 2017, ROP reported 94.44% (17/18) compliance with Indicator 11, the 60-day timeline requirement for initial evaluation. The one initial evaluation that didn't meet the 60-day timeline requirement was completed five days after the due date. A written notification of findings of noncompliance for this one untimely initial evaluation was issued to the Special Education Program because this initial evaluation was related to a preschooler attending the Head Start Program. Based on the Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Palau Community Action Agency, the administrator of the Head Start Program, initial evaluations for determining eligibility of preschoolers with disabilities attending the Head Start Program is the responsibility of the MOE Special Education Program. The tracking of the completion of the assessment process by the due date is the responsibility of the MOE Special Education Program Preschool Unit Education Specialist.

In FFY 2018, the MOE Special Education Program Preschool Unit was able to demonstrate timely correction of the Indicator 11 regulatory requirements. ROP verified that the Special Education Program was correctly implementing the Indicator 11 regulatory requirements through a review of the IEP documents for the individual instance and subsequent data in the Special Education Data System (SEDS), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Verified timely correction is further evidenced by the 100% (25/25) performance in FFY 2018 for Indicator 11; of which, two were initial evaluations for preschool age children.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In FFY 2017, the one initial evaluation that didn't meet the 60-day timeline requirement was verified to be completed through an individual file review of the IEP documents. As reported in FFY 2017, this one untimely initial evaluation was completed five days after the due date.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

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

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	98.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
18	18	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data Source: The secondary transition data was taken from the database system of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition for the report year July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019. 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.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	25.00%	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%
A	11.00%	Data	33.33%	14.29%	16.67%	40.00%	40.00%
B	2009	Target >=	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%
B	56.00%	Data	50.00%	57.14%	33.33%	60.00%	60.00%
C	2009	Target >=	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%
C	100.00%	Data	100.00%	85.71%	83.33%	100.00%	70.00%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	50.00%	50.00%
Target B >=	60.00%	60.00%
Target C >=	100.00%	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

FFY 2018 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	5
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	0
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	2
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	0	5	40.00%	50.00%	0.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1	5	60.00%	60.00%	20.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	3	5	70.00%	100.00%	60.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>In FFY 2018, ROP reported slippage in all Indicator 14 measures - 14A, 14B, and 14C. Due to ROP's small "n" size, it is important to consider that the ratio may fluctuate considerably if the numbers change by 1. In FFY 2017, there was a total of 10 leavers versus five in FFY 2018.</p> <p>According to the survey results, the five leavers included: 1 leaver in competitive employment, 1 leaver completing a term in an education and employment training program, 1 leaver completing a term in an employment training program, 1 leaver remaining at home to care for her newborn child, and 1 leaver "not engaged" due to challenges that made it difficult for the student to engage in post-secondary activities.</p> <p>Possible reasons for the slippage could be attributed to the interest of the leavers toward employment and personal circumstances and support needs.</p>
B	<p>In FFY 2018, ROP reported slippage in all Indicator 14 measures - 14A, 14B, and 14C. Due to ROP's small "n" size, it is important to consider that the ratio may fluctuate considerably if the numbers change by 1. In FFY 2017, there was a total of 10 leavers versus five in FFY 2018.</p> <p>According to the survey results, the five leavers included: 1 leaver in competitive employment, 1 leaver completing a term in an education and employment training program, 1 leaver completing a term in an employment training program, 1 leaver remaining at home to care for her newborn child, and 1 leaver "not engaged" due to challenges that made it difficult for the student to engage in post-secondary activities.</p> <p>Possible reasons for the slippage could be attributed to the interest of the leavers toward employment and personal circumstances and support needs.</p>
C	<p>In FFY 2018, ROP reported slippage in all Indicator 14 measures - 14A, 14B, and 14C. Due to ROP's small "n" size, it is important to consider that the ratio may fluctuate considerably if the numbers change by 1. In FFY 2017, there was a total of 10 leavers versus five in FFY 2018.</p> <p>According to the survey results, the five leavers included: 1 leaver in competitive employment, 1 leaver completing a term in an education and employment training program, 1 leaver completing a term in an employment training program, 1 leaver remaining at home to care for her newborn child, and 1 leaver "not engaged" due to challenges that made it difficult for the student to engage in post-secondary activities.</p> <p>Possible reasons for the slippage could be attributed to the interest of the leavers toward employment and personal circumstances and support needs.</p>

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

ROP reports that the FFY 2018 leaver response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. ROP reported 100% (5/5) leaver response rate for FFY 2018.

The ROP 2017-2018 IDEA 618 exit report included a total of seven exiters: one graduate with a high school diploma; five who dropped out; and one who died. The five exiters who dropped out included one exiter who dropped out from elementary school. For reporting FFY 2018 Indicator 14 leaver data, the total number of 2017-2018 exiters considered leavers from high school was five: one graduate with a high school diploma and four who dropped out of high school.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

ROP provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

Per OSEP, ROP is not required to provide targets for Indicator 15 until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

ROP reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. ROP is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP stakeholders include the Ministry of Education Management Team, school administrators, teachers, and parents of children with disabilities. The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), comprised of representatives of ROP stakeholders, serves as the key stakeholder group in the review and development of ROP's SPP and APR, including setting ROP-determined indicator targets.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2018 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. In addition, with input from stakeholders, this FFY 2018 APR includes ROP identified targets for the FFY 2019 results indicators. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP.

Per OSEP, ROP is not required to provide targets for Indicator 16 until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

ROP reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. ROP is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Nora Renguul

Title:

Special Education Program Coordinator

Email:

norarenguul@palaumoe.net

Phone:

(680) 488-2568

Submitted on:

04/30/20 3:08:04 AM