

**STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2021**

**Palau**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2023**

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

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Increased percentage of students with and without disabilities in grades 1-3 in the target school performing at the proficient level in ROP's state-wide assessments for Reading.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

ROP's SSIP represents a subset of children with disabilities in ROP. ROP's SiMR targets grades 1-3 in one elementary school.

#### Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

[http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP%20Theory%20of%20Action\\_508%20Compliant.pdf](http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP%20Theory%20of%20Action_508%20Compliant.pdf)

The Theory of Action remains the same with the long-term outcomes referencing the state-wide assessments instead of the PERA, which is the change in the data source.

#### Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

YES

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2021	46.04%
B	2021	x <sup>1</sup>

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	46.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%
Target B >=	25.00%	25.00%	27.00%	29.00%	31.00%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Part	Students in Grades 1-3 at the Target School Who Scored at Proficient or Above	Students in Grades 1-3 at the Target School Who Took the State-Wide Assessment and Received a Valid Score	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	93	202	60.55%	46.00%	46.04%	N/A	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Data suppressed due to small cell size.

B	x <sup>2</sup>	4	0.00%	25.00%	x <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A
---	----------------	---	-------	--------	----------------	-----	-----

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

The data source has changed from the Palau English Reading Assessment (PERA) to ROP's state-wide assessments (IOWA and the portfolio system for the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS)). The reason for the change in the data source is because the Ministry has shifted its priorities for measuring student achievement. Beginning school year 2021-2022, the Ministry's implementation of the IOWA assessments included grades 1 and 2, and effective school year 2022-2023, discontinued the use of PERA.

The IOWA assessment was identified by the ROP Ministry of Education (MOE) as the National Standardized Student Assessment to meet the mandate by Palau Public Law 10-10 (RPPL 10-10). It is a norm-reference test that compares student achievement levels to established benchmarks and tracking academic preparedness for college readiness and careers. It monitors growth using a continuous, researched-based, vertical scale to accurately measure academic progress of students.

The IOWA assessment is administered in the Spring each year. It was first administered in Spring 2018 for students in grades 3-11 until Spring 2022 when it was administered for students in grades 1-11. The test scores guide the management, school principals, program coordinators, teachers and parents, curriculum and professional developers, and policy decision-makers to evaluate education systems and make adjustments for improvements. It is designed to inform Instruction for student centered learning to personalize instructions to improve teaching and learning.

The normal distribution curve measurement indicating scaled scores by national percentile rank (NPR) and national stanine (NS) measures the students test scores by ranking (NPR) and average scores (NS) of the students who took the test in grades 1-11 in all schools in Palau. There are three performance levels (below average, average, above average). Proficient is defined as at least 23rd percentile. The results are reported at three levels; Palau-wide or National level, Building or School level, and Class or Student level.

As displayed in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR data tables, the two target measures were of grades 1-3 at the target school. For this reporting period, there were no students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at the target school that required an AA-AAAS. The state-wide assessment data reported were from the IOWA Reading assessment.

A = All students in grades 1-3 the target school who performed at the proficient level in the state-wide assessment in Reading.  
 B = Students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at the target school who performed at the proficient level in the state-wide assessment in Reading.

The FFY 2021 data for "A" includes all students in grades 1-3, inclusive of students with an IEP, in the target school who took the state-wide assessment and received a valid score. There was a total of 202 students in grades 1-3 at the target school who took the state-wide assessment in Reading and received a valid score. Of the total (denominator), 93 students in grades 1-3 scored proficient or above (numerator). Overall, the percentage was 46.04% (93/202) for ROP's FFY 2021 performance for "A." By grades, the breakdown was as follows:

Grade 1 = 64.06% (41/64)  
 Grade 2 = 39.06% (25/64)  
 Grade 3 = 36.49% (27/74)

The FFY 2021 data for "B" includes students with an IEP in grades 1-3 in the target school who took the state-wide assessment and received a valid score. There was a total of four students with an IEP in grades 1-3 at the target school who took the state-wide assessment in Reading and received a valid score. Of the total (denominator), x studentx with an IEP in grades 1-3 scored proficient or above (numerator). Overall, the percentage was x% (x/4) for ROP's FFY 2021 performance for "B." Because of the small "n" size, ROP reports the students with IEP data as an overall percentage and total number and not by grade-level.

In January 2023, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members recommended to re-establish baseline and revise targets because the data source changed from PERA to state-wide assessments or the summative assessments in Reading. The PERA data were of the reading comprehension element, whereas the IOWA and AA-AAAS data assesses overall reading skills. ROP therefore updated the Historical Data table to indicate baseline in FFY 2021 and the Targets table includes the revised targets for FFY 2021 to FFY 2025.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

The MOE Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Division of School Testing and Data Collection facilitates the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the IOWA assessments in all schools. During assessment the school principal supervises the administration of the assessment while teachers administers the test to their students and an assigned Ministry of Education staff is present as the test monitor. The assessment is administered in 2 days with an additional day to accommodate those who were absent and students with disabilities. Test times varies from 30 minutes to 45 minutes, additional time is given in increments of 10 minutes. Other accommodations are also provided based on student IEPs.

<sup>2</sup> Data suppressed due to smal cell size.

<sup>3</sup> Data suppressed due to smal cell size.

The Special Education Program supports the schools to implement the AA-AAAS for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The AA-AAAS portfolio system is implemented by the special education teacher most familiar with the student. The scoring and interpretation of results are facilitated by the Special Education Program.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

The Reading Success Network (RSN) is used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to assess progress toward the SiMR. It is an interim assessment administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year.

Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment. The practice tests will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intersession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform lesson plans, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

[http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP.SSIPEvaluationPlan\\_508%20Compliant.pdf](http://173.230.128.80/docs/sped/2022/ROP.SSIPEvaluationPlan_508%20Compliant.pdf)

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Coherent Strategy (CS) #1: (Evaluation Plan CS #1a & b): CS #1 activities assessed teacher perceptions of their knowledge, skills, and attitudes for implementing evidence-based reading instruction through participation in professional development activities focused on the use of data and identifying appropriate reading interventions for struggling learners. Coaching support was implemented with observations conducted to assess teacher behavior changes.

MOE Training and Technical Assistance: As part of the MOE system of supports, MOE implemented professional development for the target school on the use of data and identifying appropriate reading interventions. In addition, specific training sessions were held for the target school related to the IEP development and implementation (CS #3b). All schools implemented the Professional Learning Community (PLC) framework for grade-level and vertical grade-level teams to meet and discuss student data and instructional support needs. At the SSIP target school, the grade-level PLCs met every Monday afternoon with scheduled times for vertical grade-level teams – grades 1-3 – to meet.

Instructional Coaching: Beginning school year 2021-2022, MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. The PICP utilizes the Palau Professional Learning framework developed in partnership with the Palau Community College and the Regional Education Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific) at McREL International. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers. The instructional coaching support utilizes a team approach that includes an education specialist teaming with the school principal to support the identified teacher. Because this is the first year of implementation, MOE facilitated a virtual training series conducted by an off-island consultant. At the SSIP target school, the coaching team identified a new 3rd grade teacher. Specific processes, including planning meetings and observations, are being implemented. MOE tools have been developed to document the support provided and the outcomes related to changes in instructional practices.

MOE Observation Tool: This tool consists of elements for the seven teaching standards which cover aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development, which support evidence of teacher behavior changes. The SSIP target school observations were conducted in 2021-2022 and the first semester of 2022-2023.

CS #2: (Evaluation Plan CS #2): The Reading Success Network (RSN) was used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to assess progress toward the SiMR. The RSN is an interim assessment administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year, for the purpose of measuring student progress.

Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intercession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intercession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments. The practice tests will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intercession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform lesson plans, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed.

CS #3: (Evaluation Plan CS #3a, b, & c): CS #3 incorporated a systematic process for improving instruction through the use of data to inform how teachers can modify and/or adjust teaching and learning in the classroom to improve reading instruction. Data collection, analysis, interpretation, and application are a cyclical process. The CS #3 activities established written Standard of Practice (SOP) for a systematic student data review process, also known as progress monitoring.

The student data review process includes the use of the Student Reading Profile for identifying struggling learners and to keep track of their performance and intervention needs. Implementation was noted to begin in school year 2021-2022. This included understanding the use of the PERA and RSN data results at the grade, classroom, and individual student levels. The MOE education specialists continued to provide professional development related to data literacy and instructional strategies. In January 2022, the first session on intensive intervention was held to demonstrate how using student data can lead to understanding what interventions are needed in addition to the core instruction. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the increased number of positive cases in Palau, schools were closed beginning January 17, 2022 and instruction transitioned to remote learning, with the younger grades receiving instructional packets (paper-based learning). This school closure included the transition from in-person professional development to virtual training activities. The first session in January 2022 was therefore conducted virtually with technical support from University of Guam CEDDERS. The MOE education specialists utilized the "User Guide for the Sample Reading Lessons" and video resources available through the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII). The virtual sessions continued through April 2022 to support the SSIP target school understand how to determine needed intensive interventions based on student data and the use of progress monitoring.

CS #4: (Evaluation Plan CS #4): Starting with 1st grade will be important. Starting with preschool will be even more critical. MOE has two Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with the Head Start Program: One for special education child find and the other for MOE as an educational system. The collaboration focus for CS #4 has been on the collaborative partnership between MOE and Head Start to address the grade retention rate of 1st graders.

MOE continued to collaborate with the Head Start Program to schedule the 1st grade student orientation day that included administering the first part of the 1st grade RSN screening. MOE requested the Head Start Program to include data sharing in the MOU to incorporate student data information into the MOE student data system as part of the transition of preschoolers to first grade.

Beginning school year 2022-2023, MOE opened the school year with Kindergartners in all MOE elementary schools. Currently, the SSIP target school has one Kindergarten class. This change would need to be examined in relation to how CS #4 will be adjusted, if needed, to address the continued collaborative efforts between MOE and the Head Start Program.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SIMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

School Year 2021-2022 welcomed a new Minister of Education and Director of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). With the Director of the Bureau of School Operations, the MOE leadership team transformed the Ministry's organizational structure to streamline programs and services that directly impact student learning under the supervision of the BCI. The BCI now includes three Divisions: School Testing and Data Collection; Curriculum Development and Implementation; and Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing Education. These BCI Divisions ensure system coherence between assessment, curriculum, and instruction enhanced through training and technical assistance to strengthen the teacher and learning dynamic. The Special Education Program continues to be under the BCI as one of the programs that directly impact student learning. This new Governance system framework re-prioritizes how the Ministry operates to improve student achievement for all students. Beginning school year 2022-2023, system changes include implementing:

- A year-round school schedule. The academic year begins in July with the school year divided into four quarters with a short intercession between each quarter.
- Kindergarten in all elementary schools.
- Increased reading/language arts instructional time to 90 minutes each school day.
- Targeted training in areas for improvement based on student data implemented in smaller groups or school-specific sessions.

The SSIP focus continues to align with the Ministry's new Governance system framework. The SSIP short-term and intermediate outcomes achieved by coherent strategy supports the overall Ministry focus on improving student achievement. The mechanisms for improvement used by the SSIP target school provide relevant data and information for how the system changes support teachers and students. As communicated by the MOE leadership, the SSIP is not a "thing." It is what we do to improve student outcomes. It is a process within the system improvement efforts of the Ministry that addresses specific infrastructure improvement needs of the schools through an additional lens on one school. What we learn from the SSIP target school will assist with understanding how the system supports all schools.

CS #1: Systems framework = data, professional development (PD), technical assistance (TA). The annual pre/post self-assessment

tool was developed specifically for the SSIP activities. This tool has been incorporated into MOE training activities. The use of existing MOE tools support system changes and sustainability of improvement efforts. With the infrastructure changes in the Ministry beginning school year 2022-2023, the SSIP target school continued to support the impact of the overall MOE system improvement efforts for increasing English literacy proficiency. The systems framework of data, PD, and TA provide targeted support in all schools and not just for the SSIP target school.

The CS #1 short-term outcomes target increased knowledge, skills, and attitudes for implementing evidence-based practices (EBP) in reading instruction. The CS #1 intermediate outcomes target increased implementation of EBP in reading instruction. As outlined in the ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan, the training evaluation and observation tools were used to assist in determining the extent teachers have increased knowledge, skills, and attitudes that can be seen in teacher behavior changes.

In previous years, the pre/post self-assessments have shown an increase in teacher perceptions of knowledge and skills related to English literacy EBP, with minimal change in teacher behaviors for implementing English literacy EBP. The observation data conducted during the first semester of school year 2021-2022 and school year 2022-2023 showed positive changes in teacher behaviors at the SSIP target school. Based on the observation data, teachers are demonstrating application of the English literacy EBP in the classrooms.

CS #2: Systems framework = data, quality standards, PD, TA. RSN is used to collect and report secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to measure progress towards meeting the SIMR. Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment.

CS #2 addresses the systems framework related to data, quality standards, PD, and TA. A consideration with the system implementation of the RSN is that it is administered by the one SSIP target school with the intent to scale-up its use in other schools. However, with the MOE Intersession Practice Tests being administered in all schools, reviewing the use of both assessment tools at the target school will assist in determining if these assessments are duplicative or complementary. The RSN provides student-level information to identify areas of focus for instructional supports and interventions. Similarly, the MOE Intersession Practice Test is designed to inform instruction. CS #2 short-term and intermediate outcomes target increased knowledge and skills on the administration of the interim assessment and the ability to administer the interim assessment. With fidelity of administration, student results data will help in targeting specific skills development through individualized and/or small group interventions. For this year's administration of the RSN, the CS #2 short-term and intermediate outcomes continued to demonstrate fidelity of administration.

CS #3: Systems framework = data, PD, TA. As discussed earlier, CS #3 incorporates a systematic process for improving instruction through the use of data to inform how teachers can modify and/or adjust teaching and learning in the classroom to improve reading instruction. This process is designed to identify and support the intervention needs of struggling learners, inclusive of students with disabilities.

The CS #3 short-term and intermediate outcomes relate to increasing knowledge, skills, and use of student data for identifying struggling learners and monitoring student progress. Student data and teacher feedback identified the need for additional training on identifying and implementing intensive intervention. The MOE education specialists developed a training series that utilized the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) resources for data decision-making and identifying interventions. The virtual training series started in January 2022 and continued through April 2022 for the target school. In addition, MOE partnered with the PROGRESS Center, an OSEP-funded center, that supports teachers in the development and implementation of the IEP. The PROGRESS Center resources complements the NCII resources targeting the program development needs of students with an IEP.

CS #4: Systems framework = governance and TA. A major infrastructure change for MOE was the start of Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023. This change will be examined in school year 2022-2023 to determine how CS #4 will be adjusted, if needed, to address continued collaborative efforts between MOE and the Head Start Program.

The CS #4 short-term and intermediate outcomes have focused on increased knowledge and skills by both organizations, MOE and the Head Start Program, on the implementation of collaborative early literacy activities and data sharing. Meetings have been held between MOE and the Head Start Program regarding how collaborative early literacy activities are critical for increasing early literacy skills in preschoolers as they enter elementary school, which now includes Kindergarten.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.**

CS #1: Beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. The PICP utilizes the Palau Professional Learning framework developed in partnership with the Palau Community College and the Regional Education Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific) at McREL International. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers. School year 2022-2023 will provide implementation data related to the PICP.

CS #2: Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment. The practice tests will be administered three times per year prior to the MOE Intersession. Student scores will be analyzed and used to inform lesson plans, differentiated instruction, and additional time and support for students as needed. School year 2022-2023 will provide information on the use of the two assessment tools, the RSN and the practice tests, at the target school to determine if these assessments are duplicative or complementary.

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

Following the ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan strategies/activities, identified next steps and anticipated outcomes for each Coherent Strategy (CS) as follows:

CS#1: The use of the MOE Observation Tool will support the evidence of implementation of EBP – teacher behavior changes. This will be supported by the new instructional coaching framework of the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). The MOE PICP replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers. School year 2022-2023 will provide implementation data related to the PICP.

Next Steps: Continued use of the observations at the target school and implementation of the PICP (coaching).

Anticipated Outcomes: Increased application of early literacy EBP will result in increased reading proficiency in the early grades.

CS#2: The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment in the target school. Beginning school year 2022-2023, the MOE Intersession Practice Tests will be implemented to inform lesson planning. The MOE Intersession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments, ROP's state-wide assessment.

Next Steps: With the introduction of the MOE Intersession Practice Tests in school year 2022-2023, the scale-up plan for the RSN was not implemented in school year 2022-2023. School year 2022-2023 will provide information on the use of the two assessment tools, the RSN and the practice tests, at the target school to determine if these assessments are duplicative or complementary.

Anticipated Outcomes: MOE BCI leadership will assess the effectiveness of using both the RSN and the MOE Intersession Practice Tests. Currently, the RSN is limited to the SSIP activities and the MOE Intersession Practice Tests is administered in all schools.

CS#3: Although sessions have been conducted to review the Focus of Concern (FOC) Standard Operating Procedures, teachers expressed a need for continued support, including examples of how to complete the process. In addition, teacher feedback from training sessions indicated the need for additional training on interventions for struggling learners.

Next Steps: Continuation of targeted training related to the identification and implementation of intensive interventions for struggling learners, inclusive of the development and implementation of IEPs. The development of case studies of students with an IEP to gauge teacher behavior change for improving instructional practices for students with disabilities.

Anticipated Outcomes: Incorporating the NCII, PROGRESS Center, and other nationally recognized center resources into existing MOE resources and supports will increase the likelihood of sustaining the supports beyond SSIP. The MOE BCI leadership has prioritized enhancing their MOE website to be a source for stakeholders to access relevant resources related to student achievement, inclusive of resources for students with disabilities. In addition, student data for students with an IEP will indicate improved progress of their Reading skills.

CS#4: MOU between MOE & the Head Start Program in effect with a request by MOE to include data sharing. A major infrastructure change for MOE was the start of Kindergarten in all MOE elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023. This change will be examined in school year 2022-2023 to determine how CS #4 will be adjusted, if needed, to address continued collaborative efforts between MOE and the Head Start Program.

Next Step: MOE opening Kindergarten classes for five-year old students in all elementary schools beginning school year 2022-2023 will require meeting with the Head Start Program to identify continued collaborative activities in early literacy development.

Anticipated Outcomes: Continued collaboration between the Head Start Program and MOE will result in increased opportunities for joint activities to promote early literacy development.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment  
Differentiated Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (UDL)  
Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction  
Instructional Coaching

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment: The RSN is used to collect and report secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, and to measure progress towards meeting the SIMR. With technical support from the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), the RSN is considered an interim assessment administered three times a year: beginning, middle, and end of year, for the purposes of measuring progress, which is the intent of the use of the RSN to measure progress towards the SIMR.

Differentiated Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (UDL): As part of the core instruction and multi-tiered system of supports, differentiated instruction and UDL aims to personalize lessons to accommodate struggling learners in the classroom and to ensure that all students have access to the curriculum. UDL is designed to improve student access and skills in order to become a proficient reader.

Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction: These are key instructional principles for improving academic skills. Explicit instruction utilizes the “model, lead, and test” framework of instruction. Teachers model and provide guided practice until the students are able to independently apply the skills. Systematic instruction is the instructional process for developing simple to complex skills. It is providing a logical sequence for learning. These two key instructional principles have been part of the MOE intensive intervention training series using the NCII resources.

Instructional Coaching: As discussed earlier, beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. The PICP utilizes the Palau Professional Learning framework developed in partnership with the Palau Community College and the Regional Education Laboratory-Pacific (REL-Pacific) at McREL International. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SIMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

In Phase I, ROP developed its Theory of Action “if-then” statements to outline the relationship between what MOE does and the intended outcomes related to teachers, students, and the system. If ROP implements the coherent strategies (CS), then there will be short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes. Each CS incorporates relevant EBP to meet the intended outcomes. The ROP SSIP Evaluation Plan was developed to collect and analyze data and information in response to the intended outcomes framed as evaluation questions. The evaluation questions followed the same “if-then” process, for example, if ROP implemented professional development on EBP in Reading, then it will result in increased teacher knowledge and skills in EBP in Reading.

From the beginning, ROP’s SSIP incorporated existing MOE processes and tools for improving instruction. The intent has been to support MOE strengthen its use of EBP. The documented experiences of the SSIP target school will inform MOE about the effectiveness of its processes and tools for improving student outcomes. As discussed earlier, the change in the Ministry’s organizational structure streamlined programs and services that directly impact student learning under the supervision of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction (BCI). The BCI now includes three Divisions: School Testing and Data Collection; Curriculum Development and Implementation; and Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing Education. These BCI Divisions ensure system coherence between assessment, curriculum, and instruction enhanced through training and technical assistance to strengthen the teacher and learning dynamic. The SSIP efforts have shifted to targeted support prioritized through the review of data and information and communication between the target school Principal, Special Education Program Coordinator, and the Chief of Instructional Induction, Teacher Professional Development and Continuing Education. The what, why, and how of the SSIP implementation is led by the MOE BCI leadership to ensure that what we learn for the target school will influence the changes in system-wide policies, procedures, and practices.

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

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

To monitor fidelity of implementation, the evaluation scoring rubric was used for the administration of the RSN (CS #2). Each administration included an observation of the teacher administering the RSN. An observation checklist was utilized to determine whether the teachers were administering the RSN to fidelity. The SSIP target school teachers showed an implementation level of “3” for the August 2021 (100% (12/12)) and November 2021 (100% (12/12)) administration, demonstrating “strong” implementation of the RSN. With consistent evidence over the years of strong implementation of the RSN administration, school year 2022-2023 SSIP activities did not include gathering observation data related to the RSN administration. Another factor for not collecting the data was that grades 1-3 teachers remained the same as the previous year.

To assess practice change, the SSIP target school observations were conducted related to early literacy elements and strategies. As reported in previous years, the results of the self-assessment surveys and training evaluations indicated that teachers increased their knowledge and skills of early literacy EBP. However, observations conducted showed little to some implementation. The updated MOE Observation Tool covered aspects of teaching to strengthen professional development intended to provide evidence of teacher behavior change. Four observations were conducted for each teacher from August 2021 to November 2021. A year later, one observation was conducted for each teacher in October and November 2022. The implementation level for each observation period showed the following:



August 2021:

CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of "0" (18.18% (2/11) of teachers observed met the standard)

CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of "0" (0% (0/11) of teachers observed met the standard)

September 2021:

CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of "1" (50% (6/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of "0" (16.67% (2/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

October 2021:

CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of "2" (75% (9/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of "1" (50% (6/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

November 2021:

CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of "3" (91.67% (11/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of "2" (83.33% (10/12) of teachers observed met the standard)

October & November 2022:

CS #1a.2: Lesson Plans = implementation level of "3" (100% (8/8) of teachers observed met the standard)

CS #1a.3: EBP = implementation level of "3" (100% (8/8) of teachers observed met the standard)

Overall, the observation data showed improved performance from an implementation level of "0" for both Lesson Plans and EBP in August 2021 to an implementation level of "3" for Lesson Plans and "2" for EBP in November 2021 to an implementation level of "3" for both Lesson Plans and EBP. The frequency and process for conducting the observations could have contributed to the increased implementation levels. Within four months in 2021, teachers were observed four times. Then, a year later in 2022, each teacher was observed one time and the observation data showed strong implementation for both measures. The 2022 observation results indicate that teacher behaviors are changing to implement EBP in Reading instruction. Before and after each observation, a meeting was held between the observer and teacher to discuss the schedule for the observation and outcomes of the observation. This provided the teachers with feedback on what and why of the observation ratings selected before the next scheduled observation. The intentional development and implementation of targeted training for the target school could have attributed to the positive practice change seen through the observations conducted in October and November 2022. The MOE held the early literacy training in October 2021 followed by the consultant conducting a virtual observation in November 2021. In January 2022 through December 2022, targeted training for the target school teachers focused on the use of student data to identify and provide appropriate interventions and the development and implementation of IEPs for students with disabilities.

As discussed earlier, beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. School year 2022-2023 will provide implementation data related to the PICP.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

As discussed earlier, the RSN is used as secondary data to assist the target school with designing grade, class, and individual interventions, as well as gauge progress towards the SIMR. In previous years, trend and cohort data have been reviewed to identify professional development and technical assistance needs for early literacy EBP, such as the intensive intervention training series using the NCII resources and the partnership with another OSEP-funded Center, the PROGRESS Center, to support schools on the development and implementation of IEPs.

For school year 2022-2023, the RSN data revealed that the 1st grade performance in the first administration in August 2022 was significantly higher than the first administration in previous school year. The proficiency performance for the six Reading elements assessed ranged from 16% to 69% in August 2022 compared to 1% to 27% in August 2021. The second administration in December 2022 also showed higher percentages in performance for each element compared to last school year's second administration: 32% to 86% in December 2022 compared to 14% to 79% in December 2021. In addition, the 1st grade performance for each Reading element showed an increase in percentage from the first administration in August 2022 to the second administration in December 2022. Performance data for 1st grade is reviewed more closely each year because 1st grade is the first group to enter elementary school. Most 1st graders prior to enrolling have school experience through the Head Start Program or a private preschool.

All three grades demonstrated increased percentages for all but one Reading element for one of the grades assessed in August 2022 to December 2022 from a range of percent gains for 1st grade from 17% to 30%, 2nd grade from 3% to 21%, and 3rd grade from 1% to 5%. It should be noted that the smaller percent gains reported for 2nd and 3rd grades was because their performance from the first administration to the second administration was in the 88% to 99% range. The one Reading element that did not show a percent gain from August 2022 to December 2022 was the comprehension element for 3rd graders. The data decreased slightly from 75% in August 2022 to 71% in December 2022.

RSN data are also reviewed by cohorts, in particular 1st graders who would be 2nd graders the following year. As discussed earlier, the August 2021 performance data for 1st graders were significantly low. It was discussed that this low performance was due to the impact of COVID-19 on school operations at Head Start, the year before the 1st graders started at the target school. The Head Start Program reported that they were still implementing COVID-19 preventive measures which changed the instructional routines. In August 2021, 1st grade performance in the first administration ranged from 1% to 27% for the six Reading elements. In August

2022, these 1st grade group would be the 2nd grade group that performed in the first administration with a performance range of 29% to 95%. The lowest performance percentage reported for the 2nd grade group at 29% was for the comprehension Reading element.

Data from the training sessions also support the decision to continue the ongoing use of EBP. MOE BCI leadership prioritized targeted training and technical assistance to the schools, inclusive of the SSIP target school. Based on the student data and feedback from teachers, a virtual literacy intervention training series was developed and facilitated by the BCI education specialists using the NCII resources, with technical support from Guam CEDDERS. The virtual training series included four 2-hour sessions in the evening attended by all 18 grades 1-3 and special education teachers. The series outcomes included increased knowledge in the following areas: the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), using RSN and other data to identify reading skill areas of need, identifying appropriate interventions, and accessing online resources for addressing the interventions needed, in particular through the NCII website. At the end of the series, participating teachers were asked to complete an online retro-evaluation to gauge their increased knowledge of the outcome areas. The retro-evaluation asked the teacher to rate their knowledge of the content areas before the series and after the series. The rating scale used was from 1=no knowledge to 4=high-very knowledgeable. The results revealed that the teachers increased their knowledge in all outcome areas from a mean of 2 (low) before the series to a mean of 3 (moderate) after the series. This virtual training series was also offered to another elementary school to support grades 1-3 and special education teachers address the needs of struggling learners. The retro-evaluation feedback from this elementary school was similar to the increased knowledge in the outcome areas as the target school's feedback results.

Based on the training needs for supporting struggling learners, inclusive of students with an IEP, MOE partnered with the PROGRESS Center and Guam CEDDERS to hold a two-day in-person session and a half-day in-person follow-up session with the target school teachers. In September 2022, the two-day session was held with 20 target school teachers and special education related service providers. The outcomes of the session included increased knowledge of IDEA, educational framework and strategies, the role of each IEP team member, how to design high-quality educational programs, and accessing resources to support the development and implementation of programs through an IEP for students with disabilities. Using the same retro-evaluation form, the results of the feedback indicated increased knowledge of the session outcomes from a mean of 2 (low) before the session to a mean of 3 (moderate) after the session. The half-day follow-up session in December 2022 furthered the conversation and learning from September 2022. Based on the September 2022 feedback, the December 2022 follow-up session focused on the referral process for special education and understanding different disabilities. An open-ended feedback form was used for grade-level teams to provide their feedback. The results indicated that the session was relevant and useful.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The Reading Success Network (RSN) English Reading screener/Interim Assessment (CS #2): As discussed earlier, CS #2 includes the continued use of the RSN by the target school.

Next Steps: With the introduction of the MOE Intercession Practice Tests in school year 2022-2023, the scale-up plan for the RSN was not implemented. The MOE Intercession Practice Tests are based on key domains selected from the IOWA Assessments. IOWA is one of the state-wide assessment in Reading data source for ROP's SIMR.

Anticipated Outcomes: MOE BCI leadership will assess the effectiveness of using both the RSN and the MOE Intercession Practice Tests. Currently, the RSN is limited to the SSIP activities and the MOE Intercession Practice Tests is administered in all schools.

Differentiated Instruction/Universal Design for Learning (UDL) (CS #1): As part of the core instruction, differentiated instruction and UDL continue to be reinforced through professional development.

Next Steps: MOE education specialists will continue to support schools in the implementation of EBP. This includes offering targeted training sessions, school-level technical assistance, and implementation of the professional learning framework of the instructional coaching.

Anticipated Outcomes: Implementation of existing MOE resources and supports will increase the likelihood of sustaining the supports beyond SSIP.

Explicit Instruction and Systematic Instruction (CS #3): These are key instructional principles for improving academic skills. These key instructional principles have been part of the MOE intensive intervention training series using the NCII resources. Increasing knowledge and skills on the development and implementation of IEPs will support the teachers address the intervention needs of students with an IEP.

Next Steps: Continuation of targeted training related to the identification and implementation of intensive interventions for struggling learners, inclusive of the development and implementation of IEPs. The development of case studies of students with an IEP to gauge the teacher behavior change for improving instructional practices for students with disabilities. This will incorporate the student review process under CS #3.

Anticipated Outcomes: Incorporating the NCII, PROGRESS Center, and other nationally recognized center resources into existing MOE resources and supports will increase the likelihood of sustaining the supports beyond SSIP. The MOE BCI leadership has prioritized enhancing their MOE website to be a source for stakeholders to access relevant resources related to student achievement, inclusive of resources for students with disabilities. In addition, student data for students with an IEP will indicate improved progress of their Reading skills.

Instructional Coaching (CS #1): As discussed earlier, beginning school year 2021-2022, the MOE developed the Palau Induction/Coaching Program (PICP). This program replaces the Mentor/Mentee program that was described as the SSIP coaching support in previous years. This framework provides guidance on how to design, implement, and evaluate healthy and sustained professional learning experiences for teachers that support improved student outcomes. The instructional coaching component of the PICP serves as support for teachers identified as needing extra assistance in teaching, which could include new teachers.

Next Steps: Coaching data in school year 2022-2023 will assist in prioritizing targeted training and technical assistance to the schools.

Anticipated Outcomes: Increased application of early literacy EBP will result in increased reading proficiency in the early grades.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The results from the observations, training, and RSN administration indicate that we are on track with the SSIP activities at this time. The coaching data will be reviewed in school year 2022-2023.

### **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

#### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

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 Annual Performance Report (APR). The Special Education Coordinator, Special Education Specialists (previously known as CRTs), and Data Manager are responsible for facilitating ROP's broad stakeholder input.

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. For the FFY 2021-FFY 2025 SPP development, representatives from the Palau Parent Empowered (PPE), an organization for parents of children with disabilities, and Omekesang, an organization for individuals with disabilities, were included in the SPP/APR review to ensure broad stakeholder input. The PPE also serves as the Palau Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center through the Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH) Pacific PTI Project funded by OSEP.

In addition, stakeholders for the development and implementation of ROP's SPP Indicator 17: SSIP include key MOE Chiefs, Coordinator/s, Specialists, and Target School Administrators with updates and communication provided to the respective MOE Directors. The SSIP School Team is comprised of the target school administrators and teachers, with regular communication for disseminating information and gathering input from parents.

In January 2023, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) members recommended to re-establish baseline and revise targets because the data source changed from PERA to state-wide assessments or the summative assessments in Reading. The PERA data were of the reading comprehension element, whereas the IOWA and AA-AAAS data assesses overall reading skills. ROP therefore updated the Historical Data table to indicate baseline in FFY 2021 and the Targets table includes the revised targets for FFY 2021 to FFY 2025.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Specific strategies for engagement of stakeholders, in particular, the teachers include small group sessions to target specific training and technical assistance needs. The MOE BCI leadership has prioritized targeted support to the schools, including the SSIP target school. Improvement efforts are addressed through the on-going feedback received from principals, teachers, and parents.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

N/A

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

N/A

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

N/A

### **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Palau did not provide its State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Palau must provide the FFY 2021 SiMR in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Palau included its SiMR in the Indicator Data section. The data source has changed but the SiMR focus remains the same, as explained in the Indicator Data section.

### **17 - OSEP Response**

ROP has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

ROP revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **17 - Required Actions**