

PW
Part B

FFY2014
State Performance Plan /
Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This Executive Summary includes a description of Republic of Palau (ROP) IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2014. A description of the 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 2014 APR.

In FFY 2013, with input from stakeholders, ROP identified targets for the Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2014 APR includes current performance data on 13 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 9, 10, and 12 do not apply to ROP. In addition, Indicators 3A and 4B measures do not apply to the ROP. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, ROP reports FFY 2014 data to determine if ROP met its FFY 2014 target, provides an explanation of slippage if ROP did not meet its target, and responds to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2015 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for ROP's FFY 2013 SPP/APR. Although ROP did not meet all its results indicator targets in FFY 2014, the stakeholders recommended not to revise the targets at this time.

Per OSEP's instructions, Republic of Palau decided to take that opportunity and requested and approved to submit FFY 2014 APR on February 8, 2016.

As required, for Indicator 17, ROP's Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), ROP will submit its SSIP Phase II, including a description of ROP's Infrastructure development, Implementation strategies of Evidenced Based Practices in the target school and an Evaluation Plan, no later than April 1, 2016.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary education system that includes 16 elementary schools for grades 1-8 and one public high school for grades 9-12. The Special Education Program is a program under the direct supervision of the Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). The delivery of special education and related services is provided within the schools under the supervision of the school principals. The Chief of the Division of School Management serves as the direct supervisor of the school principals.

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

Demonstration of accountability measures under IDEA is seen through a system of general supervision. ROP MOE has in place policies and procedures, consistent with the IDEA Part B requirements for providing special education and related services for children with disabilities. ROP MOE also has in place the IDEA Notice of Procedural Safeguards provided to parents of children with disabilities.

Another component of ROP's system of general supervision is the comprehensive monitoring of the implementation of IDEA, with a focus on improving results for children and youth with disabilities. ROP MOE developed the Continuous Improvement

Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) that includes on-site and off-site monitoring activities, with written guidance for the identification and correction of noncompliance, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. ROP MOE has designated the Special Education Program to facilitate the implementation of the CIFMS through the Chief of School Management. For the Head Start Program, the CIFMS is facilitated through the BCI Director to the Head Start Program Director. The ROP-MOE Special Education Program is administered by the Special Education Coordinator. The Special Education Coordinator supervises special education personnel responsible for supporting the development and delivery of special education and related services in the schools and other appropriate educational settings.

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	
No APR attachments found.			

Technical Assistance System:

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

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 to collaborate with the BCI 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, Specialists/ Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs), and Data Manager hold monthly meetings to discuss the status of all improvement activities and what can be done to support indicator cluster teams carry out specific SPP indicator activities, which include collaborating with the BCI content, assessment, and training specialists to implement training activities with parents, principals, teachers, and related service providers at different times of the year. All technical assistance and support to the schools are coordinated as a system.

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

The Special Education Program also provides parent workshops focused on parent rights, state complaints, parent roles, 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, the Work Force Investment Act Program out of the Executive Office, and PPE, to provide technical assistance and support to the schools. In addition, the Special Education Program accesses US National resources, such as OSEP-funded projects, to support ROP’s efforts to improve educational results for students with disabilities. These resources, similar to resources accessed by the BCI content, assessment, and training specialists, are incorporated into and coordinated with the MOE BCI and school-level training, technical assistance, and support activities.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

The Republic of Palau (ROP), Ministry of Education (MOE) is a unitary system that ensures service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities. MOE’s professional development system includes professional standards for all teachers and implementation of specific MOE and school-level professional development training plans. Individual School Improvement Plans (SIP) target improving student academic skills, which prioritize the professional development training needs at the school-level. The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI) facilitates the training and support to school personnel for ensuring the educational programs result in successful students in Palauan society and the world. The BCI includes content, assessment, and training specialists who provide the technical assistance, training, and support to school personnel, including special education teachers. Effective June 2014, the BCI assumed administrative oversight of the Special Education Program, which changed from the Special Education Program being under the MOE Bureau of Education Administration. This change has led to more opportunities to collaborate with the BCI 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 now Palau 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 from or through Guam CEDDERS worked with Palau 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 Palau Special Education Program with US mainland and Pacific entities on related work issues.

With the OSEP’s Results-Driven Accountability focus, the BCI Director has endorsed ROP’s commitment to the development and implementation of ROP’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as a MOE Initiative. In September 2014, the BCI Director appointed key MOE administrators and staff to serve on the MOE SSIP Team. ROP’s SSIP development and implementation is viewed as an overall system improvement process that serves as one of the key MOE technical assistance and professional development efforts to impact the teaching and learning dynamic for improving the educational results for ALL students. In FFY 2014 with results of Phase 1 submitted April 1, 2015, the team began work on Phase II. The SSIP Phase II report will be submitted on April 1, 2016.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

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 2014 Annual Performance Report (APR). The SPED Core Team, comprised of the Special Education Coordinator, Specialists/Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs), and Data Manager, is responsible for facilitating ROP's stakeholder involvement.

ROP's stakeholders include the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), which serves as ROP's IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education for input on all SPP indicator targets and discussion of its APR. In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP's SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinators, Specialists, and School Administrators serving as ROP's SSIP Team with regular updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors and Chiefs.

Highlights of MOE's engagement with ROP stakeholders for the development of ROP's FFY 2013-2018 SPP, FFY 2014 APR, and the development of ROP's SPP Indicator 17 included the following:
Quarterly Updates of Special Education Program to the Ministry of Education's Management Team and all School Principals:

- o October 2014 - SY: 2014-2015 On-Site Monitoring; Monitoring Team, Target Schools, Schedule of Visits and related IDEA regulations/requirements.
- o February 2015 - Special Education Annual Performance Report 2013. Information on new initiative, State Systemic Improvement plan and submission date.
- o April 2015 - Information on APR 2013 Clarification Period. Submission of SSIP Phase I. Structured observation, monitor and support of special education service providers.
- o June 2015 - Review of SSIP Phase I and synopsis of Phase II.
- o November 2015 - Information for Off-Site Monitoring in December 2015; Data and IDEA requirements
- o January 2016- Status of SSIP Phase II; current focus of work, input on needed support on focused areas and submission date. Statewide Assessment-Indicator 3 for APR 2014; explained slippage for an opportunity for input from management team and school principals

ROP Special Advisory Council:

- o December 2015 - Orientation meeting for new SEAC members on roles, responsibilities and review of by-laws, including their responsibility to review and provide input for the SPP and APR.
- o December 2015 - SEAC met for another review of by-laws and election of new officers; chairman, vice-chairman and secretary.
- o January 2016 - SEAC met for an overview of SPP/APR indicators. Special Education Core Team addressed questions and/or provide clarification on indicators and other related issue.
- o January 2016 - SEAC met to review and provide input on APR 2014 indicators that did not meet target and reported slippage: Indicators 3B, 4, 8-School-Age, and 14A.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

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

Attachments

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	30.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%	60.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
			null	4
			null	16
				Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), ROP does not report graduation data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA. ROP uses the cohort formula established by the ROP Ministry of Education (MOE). The number of graduates reported is consistent with the number reported for the IDEA 618 Exit data. Indicator 1 data are the one-year lag data, per the measurement instructions.

Graduation rate measurement for youth with IEPs is the same measurement as for all youth in MOE. ROP uses a "cohort" calculation for determining graduation rate. At present, this calculation has no adjustment for repeaters, dropouts, withdrawals, and transfers. The MOE continues to use a cohort system to determine graduation rate for all students.

Explanation of Data Discrepancy

Please explain why the calculated total does not match the adjusted cohort graduation rate reported to the CSPR.

As one of the Freely Associated States (FAS), ROP does not report graduation data to the Department under Title 1 of ESEA. ROP uses the cohort formula established by the ROP Ministry of Education (MOE). The number of graduates reported is consistent with the number reported for the IDEA 618 Exit data.

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
4	16	14.29%	30.00%	25.00%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	10.00%	7.00%	7.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in high school who exited special education due to dropping out.	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
2	34	6.67%	10.00%	5.88%

Use a different calculation methodology

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

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

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

With stakeholder input, ROP continues to choose Option 2 to report drop-out rates for Indicator 2. ROP uses the high school enrollment and reported IDEA 618 exit data from the previous year to calculate drop-out rate following the one-year lag data requirement. For the FFY 2013 IDEA 618 exit data, there were two youth with IEPs who dropped out from high school and a total of 34 high school enrolled youth with IEPs in 2013-2014. The enrollment data for high school was taken from the ROP Ministry of Education Research and Evaluation

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

This is not applicable to Republic of Palau per OSEP instructions.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. During the December 2014 SEAC meetings, SEAC members reviewed ROP trend data and US National trend data related to the state-wide assessment results and provided considerations for target settings. As shown, the FFY 2018 target is 95% for both reading and math, which is a rigorous target from the baseline of 85% in FFY 2005.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	39	31	85.37%	80.00%	79.49%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

ROP did not meet its FFY 2014 target of 80% by 0.51% with a FFY 2014 performance of 79.49% (31/39) and reported slippage by 5.88% from a FFY 2013 performance of 85.37%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(35/41). By numbers, this slippage represented a difference of two students from six in FFY 2013 to eight in FFY 2014.

The reasons for the slippage were students with IEPs in the tested grades did not take the Palau Achievement Test (PAT) because they were absent or for "other reasons." Two students were absent and six students did not take the Reading test for "other reasons" in two elementary schools and the high school.

Special Education Program personnel met with the Division of Research and Evaluation (DRE) specialist responsible for the compilation of the PAT data to review the PAT administration procedures and "other reasons" noted for the six students with IEPs who did not take the PAT for Reading. The DRE specialist confirmed that the six students did take other administered PAT content. Special Education Program personnel also communicated with personnel from the three schools, including the principals and special education teachers, regarding the nonparticipation of the six students with IEPs in the Reading content of PAT. The discussions led to the understanding that the "other reasons" noted was primarily due to the miscommunication between general education teachers and special education teachers regarding where the students should have taken the PAT for Reading. The general education teachers indicated that the students with IEPs were not in their class at the time of the PAT for Reading, but these students were not absent from school during testing time.

Immediate actions to address this issue include putting more emphasis on the current practice which includes completion of the "PAT Participation Checklist" to document nonparticipation and the reasons. This will be discussed further during the special education teachers' quarterly meeting in March 2016 in preparation for the Spring 2016 PAT to ensure participation in PAT are properly documented for reporting of the Part B 618 data (Assessment), APR and other related reports. In addition, the Special Education Program will conduct an on-site monitoring during the administration of the Spring 2016 PAT in the three schools where "other reasons" were noted for nonparticipation in the Spring 2015 PAT. The on-site monitoring will assess the effectiveness of school-level procedures, including the use of the "PAT Participation Checklist" for administering the PAT in all content areas for students with IEPs.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	39	30	82.93%	80.00%	76.92%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

ROP did not meet its FFY 2014 target of 80% by 3.08% with a FFY 2014 performance of 76.92% (30/39) and reported slippage by 6.01% from a FFY 2013 performance of 82.93% (34/41). By numbers, this slippage represented a difference of two students from seven in FFY 2013 to nine in FFY 2014.

The reasons for the slippage were students with IEPs in the tested grades did not take the Palau Achievement Test (PAT) because they were absent or for "other reasons." Three students were absent and six students did not take the Math test for "other reasons" in two elementary schools and the high school.

Special Education Program personnel met with the Division of Research and Evaluation (DRE) specialist responsible for the compilation of the PAT data to review the PAT administration procedures and "other reasons" noted for the six students with IEPs who did not take the PAT for Math. The DRE specialist confirmed that the six students did take other administered PAT content. Special Education Program personnel also communicated with personnel from the three schools, including the principals and special education teachers, regarding the nonparticipation of the six students with IEPs in the Math content of PAT. The discussions led to the understanding that the "other reasons" noted was primarily due to the miscommunication between general education teachers and special education teachers regarding where the students should have taken the PAT for Math. The general education teachers indicated that the students with IEPs were not in their class at the time of the PAT for Math, but these students were not absent from school during testing time.

Immediate actions to address this issue include putting more emphasis on the current practice which includes completion of the "PAT Participation Checklist" to document nonparticipation and the reasons. This will be discussed further during the special education teachers' quarterly meeting in March 2016 in preparation for the Spring 2016 PAT to ensure participation in PAT are properly documented for the reporting of the Part B 618 data (Assessment), APR and other related reports. In addition, the Special Education Program will conduct an on-site monitoring during the administration of the Spring 2016 PAT in the three schools where "other reasons" were noted for nonparticipation in the Spring 2015 PAT. The on-site monitoring will assess the effectiveness of school-level procedures, including the use of the "PAT Participation Checklist" for administering the PAT in all content areas for students with IEPs.

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	15.00%	25.00%	35.00%	45.00%	55.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP’s IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. During the December 2014 SEAC meetings, SEAC members reviewed ROP trend data and US National trend data related to the state-wide assessment results and provided considerations for target settings. As shown, the FFY 2018 target for reading is 55% and 50% for math, which are considered rigorous targets from the baseline of 37% for reading and 22% for math in FFY 2007.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	31	7	17.14%	15.00%	22.58%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	30	8	11.76%	10.00%	26.67%

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1	1	0%	0%	100%

Explanation of Slippage

ROP is a unitary system and does not have LEAs. Determination of "significant discrepancy" is based on data comparison of two groups - students without disabilities and students with disabilities. Using the FFY 2013 comparison data for the two groups, ROP reports a "significant discrepancy" between the two groups, which represents the first reporting year that ROP has demonstrated slippage for Indicator 4A.

The reason for the slippage is in the decrease of the general education data for suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. In the previous reporting year, general education reported 37 long-term suspensions/expulsions, while special education reported two students with IEPs. For this reporting period, general education reported 19 long-term suspensions/expulsions, a decrease in number by 18 from 37 to 19. For special education, the number remained the same at two for this reporting period.

Special education personnel, Division of Research and Evaluation (DRE) personnel, and the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members reviewed the data for Indicator 4A and discussed the reasons for slippage, especially with the decrease in the general education data. It was determined that the reason for the significant decrease in the

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

general education data could be attributed to the ROP Attorney General's 2012 Juvenile Justice initiative that led to the implementation of the Youth Service Team (YST) beginning school year 2013-2014. The YST is an interagency commitment to decrease juvenile delinquency in the ROP. For those students who are suspended, expelled, or who dropped out, the YST comes together to offer support to these students to get them back in school and to stay in school. The support is a mentor-type program between the YST members, school, student, and family. There is a lead YST person assigned to the student and family.

Although the special education data for long-term suspension/expulsion remains the same, the two students with IEPs in 2013-2014 who were suspended greater than 10 days were supported by the YST and stayed in school during the 2014-2015 school year. The YST supports all students who were suspended, expelled, or who dropped out, including those with disabilities.

During the January 2016 SEAC meeting, SEAC members discussed how other youth programs are starting to support youth stay in school. This has led to the discussion of re-defining ROP's definition of "significant discrepancy." However, it was agreed that a closer look at the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 long-term suspension/expulsion data should be reviewed in FFY 2015 to determine if ROP's "significant discrepancy" definition should be changed.

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

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

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

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

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

FFY 2014 data represent the one-year data lag requirement with the relative difference calculated as follows using data from 2013-2014: **2.06% (2/97=students with disabilities) – 0.85% (19/2225=students without disabilities) = 1.21% divided by 0.85% = 1.42 Relative Difference**

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, **not including correction of findings**

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

ROP reported significant discrepancy for Indicator 4A. In FFY 2014, ROP reviewed its policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to determine if they contributed to the significant discrepancy reported for Indicator 4A. Based

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

on the review, ROP determined that the significant discrepancy is not due to ROP's policies, procedures, and practices. ROP did not identify noncompliance with the Part B requirements as a result of the review required under 34 CFR Section 300.170(b). ROP assures that its policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards comply with the IDEA requirements.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
 - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
- The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

This indicator is not applicable.

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	55.00%	55.00%	57.00%	60.00%	62.00%
Target B ≤	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%	11.00%	11.00%
Target C ≤	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. During the July and December 2014 SEAC meetings, SEAC members reviewed ROP trend data and US National trend data related to School-Age LRE. Through ROP's LRE Initiative, it was acknowledged that ROP has made significant progress in including students with IEPs in general education settings. SEAC provided input to targets with the FFY 2018 target at 62% for 5A from the FFY 2005 baseline data of 18%, FFY 2018 target of 11% for 5B from the FFY 2005 baseline data of 19%, and FFY 2018 target of 2% for 5C from the FFY 2005 baseline data of 3%. All FFY 2018 targets for Indicator 5 demonstrate significant improvement from the FFY 2005 baseline data.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	100	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	n	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	null	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58	100	61.86%	55.00%	58.00%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	9	100	8.25%	12.00%	9.00%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1	100	0%	2.00%	1.00%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	80.00%	83.00%	83.00%	86.00%	100%
Target B ≤	2.00%	1.00%	1.00%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. During the July and December 2014 SEAC meetings, SEAC members reviewed ROP trend data and US National trend data related to Preschool LRE. SEAC members acknowledged that ROP continues to maintain a high percentage of preschoolers with IEPs receiving special education and related services in regular early childhood programs. SEAC members recommended setting staggered targets towards 100% for 6A and 0% for 6B in FFY 2018 to end with the same high performance as the baseline percentages in FFY 2011.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	6	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	6	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	n	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	null	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6	6	85.71%	80.00%	100%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	6	0%	2.00%	0%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	85.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100%
Target A2 ≥	60.00%	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	100%
Target B1 ≥	70.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	100%
Target B2 ≥	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	100%
Target C1 ≥	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	68.00%	100%
Target C2 ≥	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%	67.00%	100%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. During the July and December 2014 SEAC meetings, SEAC members reviewed ROP trend data and US National trend data related to Early Childhood Outcomes. SEAC members discussed the small "n" size and how that contributes to the annual performance data in relation to the the baseline data in FFY 2008.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	4.00
--	------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4.00	4.00	100%	85.00%	100%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3.00	4.00	100%	60.00%	75.00%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3.00	4.00	75.00%	70.00%	75.00%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2.00	4.00	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
--	--------------------

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4.00	4.00	100%	62.00%	100%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3.00	4.00	75.00%	62.00%	75.00%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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 made a modification of the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) forms to add 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.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Preschool Target ≥	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%
School-age Target ≥	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	99.00%	99.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Preschool	27.00	27.00	95.24%	89.00%	100%
School-age	76.00	83.00	97.47%	97.00%	91.57%

Explanation of School-age Slippage

ROP did not meet its FFY 2014 target of 97% for the school-age group and reported slippage by 5.9% from 97.47% in FFY 2013 to 91.57% in FFY 2014. It should be noted that ROP's FFY 2014 performance is significantly higher than the Indicator 8 national data at 67%. In addition, ROP's response rate increased by 4 surveys from 79 in FFY 2013 to 83 in FFY 2014, which was representative of the demographics of ROP.

ROP reviewed the survey results by survey items to determine possible reasons for slippage. The survey items that had a lower rating were related to the parent training offered by the school. During the January 2016 SEAC meeting, it was discussed that parents might have given a low rating because they were thinking that the training activities offered by the special education program were separate from what the school should be offering. All communication for the training sessions go to parents via the school principals, but for parents, especially the new parents, they might have been thinking that the school should be conducting training sessions.

To address this possible reason for slippage, ROP explored other options to address the low points of the survey for follow up activities on this indicator. The following are the main topical areas being considered for planning and implementation:

- Understanding of School and Special Education Program. The school and the special education program is part of a unitary system working together to provide parent training and other related school activities to solicit and improve parent involvement for children's overall education.
- Orientation on the parent survey forms to all parents, particularly the new parents. Explain again items of the new survey form.
- Schedule parent training by residential area instead of schools and throughout 4th quarter instead of one month at the end of the school year.
- Special Education Core Team monthly meetings to address ways for teachers to continue to encourage, strengthen parent/guardian involvement in children's education and other related activities. Results will be discussed during teachers & related service providers meeting on a quarterly basis.
- Develop a brochure that would share information about the special education program and other organizations that offer support or services to children/youth with disabilities.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

PRESCHOOL (3-5)

Data on Early Childhood Family Outcomes were collected using the Belau Preschool Family Outcome Survey, as in previous years. Surveys were distributed to all parents of preschool children (ages 3-5) receiving services during 2014-2015 school year and all nine surveys were completed and returned to the Early Childhood Special Education Program (100% return rate), which represents the demographics of ROP for preschoolers with IEPs.

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

- a. Total number of items response = 27
- b. Total number of responses indicating good to excellent = 27

Calculation – $b/a (27/27) \times 100 = 100\%$

Data Collection Method

Preschool Family Outcome Survey

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

Surveys were numbered and placed in envelopes so that parents would feel comfortable completing it and it would ensure that the surveys remained anonymous. Nine surveys were distributed and collected from parents of children (ages 3-5) receiving services during the 2014-2015 school year.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY (6-21)

The analysis of the completed parent surveys involved adding the scores for each item for each individual survey and determining the mean. The individual surveys that had a mean of 3.0 and above were considered to have met that standard

that the schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. This resulted in 91.57% (76/83) of the parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

**Part B Elementary and Secondary Special Education Survey Report for FFY 2014:
ROP RESULTS**

ALL PART B (STANDARD METHOD) FFY 2014

Percent at or above Indicator 8 standard of a rating of 3.0 and above: **76/83= 91.57%**

Number of Valid Responses: 83

Mean Measure: 3.37 Measurement SD .45

Data Collection Method

Elementary and Secondary Survey

On March 11, 2015, 91 surveys were distributed to parents of elementary and secondary students with IEPs. Eighty-three (83) surveys were collected and analyzed by Guam CEDDERS. Of the 91 students aged 6-21 that were provided a survey, 83 surveys were returned with a response rate of 91.21% (83/91), an increase from last reporting period by 4.21% from 87% (79/91) in FFY 2013. This represents an increase of 4 completed surveys from last reporting year. This is the second year of using the survey instrument. The reason for the increase in the number of surveys returned may be the result of follow-up calls made by the Special Education Coordinator and Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) encouraging the school principals and teachers to have parents return the surveys back to the school. In addition, the parent survey was translated into Palauan which may have contributed to the increase in the percentage of parents completing the surveys.

Note: There were five parents that indicated they were completing the survey for two of their children. Two parents of elementary-age children indicated two children with two different elementary grade levels. Two parents indicated a 3rd grader and a 9thth grader. The fifth parent completed the survey as a parent of two high school students. If the special education program were to treat each grade level separately, the total responses received would be 88 instead of 83.

Representation of Elementary and Secondary Respondents

Grade level:	65.1% (54/83) Elementary	34.9% (29/83) High School
Race/Ethnicity:	Palauan:	98.8% (82/83)
	Asian:	1.2% (1/83)

ROP reports that the respondents are representative of the school-age students with IEPs. In reviewing the surveys returned, the data summary represents all public elementary and high schools. As expected, with the majority of surveys returned from the elementary schools, all ages were represented in the results.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

- Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State
- No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
8	8	100%	100%	100%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	0
---	---

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

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

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

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, 2014-June 30, 2015. 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 Consulting Resource Teachers (CRTs) are responsible for documenting the initial evaluation process in the established special education forms. These completed forms are then transmitted to the Special Education Office for data input into the SEDS. The original completed forms are securely maintained at the child's school, while a copy of the completed forms is securely maintained in the Special Education Office.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

This not apply to Republic of Palau per OSEP instructions.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
25	25	100%	100%	100%

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

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

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

Data Source: The secondary transition data was taken from the database system of all youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition for the report year July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015. 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 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.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%
Target B ≥	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	60.00%
Target C ≥	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	100%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP developed its SPP targets with stakeholder input from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), ROP's IDEA Part B State Advisory Panel for Special Education. During the December 2014 SEAC meetings, SEAC members reviewed ROP trend data and US National trend data related to post-school outcomes. SEAC discussed target setting considerations given ROP's small "n" size. SEAC provided input to target setting during their December 2014 SEAC meetings.

FFY 2014 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	7.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	3.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	2.00

4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0.00
--	------

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1.00	7.00	33.33%	30.00%	14.29%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4.00	7.00	50.00%	51.00%	57.14%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	6.00	7.00	100%	75.00%	85.71%

Explanation of A Slippage

ROP did not meet its target of 30% and reported slippage by 19.04% from a FFY 2013 performance of 33.33% (2/6) to 14.29% (1/7) in FFY 2014. This slippage was a difference of one leaver in higher education. In FFY 2013, there were two leavers who were in higher education, and in FFY 2014, there was one. Given ROP’s small “n” size, the ratio of postsecondary outcomes to respondents can fluctuate greatly when the number changes by 1. The total number of leavers surveyed in FFY 2013 was six compared to seven in FFY 2014.

In FFY 2013, ROP reported a total of seven students with IEPs who exited high school: Four students graduated with a high school diploma, two students dropped out, and one student aged out. All seven FFY 2013 leavers responded to the FFY 2014 post-school survey for a 100% return rate. The survey results reported one leaver enrolled in higher education, three leavers competitively employed, two leavers in some other training program, and one leaver remained at home.

ROP’s explanation of slippage for Indicator 14A includes:

- One of the four high school graduates went to college, while the three remaining graduates were in competitive employment. Two of the graduates in competitive employment indicated a preference to work instead of pursuing higher education. One graduate in competitive employment had initially intended to pursue higher education. The leaver applied and was awaiting acceptance into a college in Japan offering scholarship opportunities to students with hearing impairments. After having received no response from the college after a period of time, the leaver decided to move in with family in the mainland United States where he was able to obtain a position in competitive employment.
- The student who aged-out completed a term of career development through the Workforce Investment Act program.
- Of the two students who dropped out, one leaver enrolled in a full-time apprenticeship program offered by the United States Civic Action Team Camp and sponsored by Palau Community Action Agency. The other student who dropped out remained at home due to health issues. Efforts made to help the leaver transition and find placement in a postsecondary program or agency were not successful because of the leaver’s health issues. As such, the leaver remained at home and continued helping family with household chores and other tasks.

The Palau High School’s Special Education Teachers continue to collaborate with Academic and Career Technical Education (CTE) program teachers to prepare students with disabilities for successful employment and educational outcome. In addition, Palau High School Counselors continue to implement for all seniors, including seniors with disabilities, a Senior College Prep program, which includes Parent Workshops designed to help parents learn ways they can assist their children through the college enrollment process.

The Youth Service Team, comprised of members of ROP’s Ministry of Education, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Health, the Judicial Branch, religious organization, and parent organization, continues to provide intervention services for students who are truant, suspended/expelled, or who have dropped out of school. Their goal is to strengthen families and family health, and improve postsecondary outcomes by encouraging these students to return to school and stay in school.

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ROP assures that the post-school outcomes survey results reported for Indicator 14 are valid and reliable. The High School Consulting Resource Teacher interviews the leaver and/or family following the National Post-School Outcomes survey protocol and questionnaire, as in previous reporting years. In addition, with a 100% (7/7) survey return rate, ROP reports that the survey results is representative of the demographics of ROP.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP did not have any hearing requests for the FFY 2014 reporting period, as in previous years. As per the FFY 2014 Measurement Table for Indicator 15, states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

ROP did not have any hearing requests for the FFY 2014 reporting period, as in previous years. As per the FFY 2014 Measurement Table for Indicator 15, states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥					

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

ROP did not have any mediation requests for the FFY 2014 reporting period, as in previous years. As per the FFY 2014 Measurement Table for Indicator 16, states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	0			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

ROP did not have any mediation requests for the FFY 2014 reporting period, as in previous years. As per the FFY 2014 Measurement Table for Indicator 16, states are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		32.00%
Data	0%	

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	42.00%	52.00%	67.00%	82.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Refer to Introduction section, pages 1-3, in the attached complete SSIP.

Overview

Data Analysis

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

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

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

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

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

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

Statement

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

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

[ROP Part B SSIP Theory of Action](#) ROP Part B SSIP Theory of Action

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

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

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Helen Sengebau

Title: Special Education Program Coordinator

Email: spedcor@palaunet.com

Phone: 680-488-2568