STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

For reporting on
FFY 2020

Northern Mariana Islands

PART B DUE February 1, 2022

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of CNMI's IDEA Part B FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). A description of the CNMI's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System and Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR and how the CNMI will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of CNMI's SPP/APR.

The Special Education Program with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), facilitated a process to determine targets for results indicators for the CNMI IDEA Part B FFY 2020-FFY 2025 SPP. The stakeholders reviewed the performance data, national data for each indicator, and engaged in a discussion of each indicator. Stakeholders included Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), State Systemic Improvement Plan Core Team, PSS Key Management Team, and the Board of Education.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Indicator 17, the SSIP Core Team, along with other stakeholders met to review baseline data and performance data, and engaged in a discussion to determine targets through FFY2025.

Specific Conditions continued to be imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI for FFY 2020. The CNMI must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on:
(1) the technical assistance sources from which the CNMI received assistance; and
(2) the actions the CNMI took as a result of that technical assistance

1. Technical assistance received: CNMI continues to work with the Department's Risk Management Service (RMS) to address CNMI's Public School System Special Conditions through onsite and other technical assistance. As a result of the technical assistance the CNMI PSS is no longer required to maintain and report on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) but is required to submit a biannual report.

2. Actions taken as a result of the RMS technical assistance: CNMI submits a biannual report with updates on its administration of Department grant funds, with an emphasis on areas of repeat audit findings. In addition, the CNMI PSS has:
-Increased communication and dialogue with Federal Fiscal Office;
-Improved information sharing regarding CNMI's longstanding non-compliance Special Conditions;
-Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years;
-Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Specific Conditions;
-Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years; and
-Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Special Conditions

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted school operations with schools closing on March 16, 2020 for the remainder of school year 2019-2020. In addition, CNMI's austerity measures due to the economic impact of the recent super typhoon natural disaster compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic also impacted school operations. For School Year 2020-21, the school district conducted a Remote Learning training for all instructional staff from August 3-26, 2020 using the new learning platform, Blackboard Collaborate. From August 27-September 3, 2020, school level professional development and school prep time took place in preparation for school reopening. The furlough was lifted for all instructional staff on August 27, but the 4-day work/school weeks continued. September 8, 2020 was the official school opening with a new mode of instruction, Remote Learning with Limited Face to Face Intervention. A Decision Tree was created to help determine which students would need the face-to-face intervention. Factors in determining placement included: student's academic performance, students with disabilities, students with social emotional needs, technological issues at home, home environment concerns, and other risk factors that require individualized attention. During this time, student and family orientation commenced, and students were issued their technology devices, laptops, tablets, mifis. Students also took the state assessment during their scheduled orientation. Orientation lasted until September 30, 2020. Schools eventually transitioned to Blended learning, allowing for two days in the classroom, two days asynchronous, one day virtual.

The impact on CNMI's data collection and reporting is reflected in the related indicators, which include the following:

-CNMI's austerity limited the availability of furloughed general education teachers who had information about the concerns regarding the students prior to schools closing. General education teachers were furloughed from April 1, 2020 – August 26, 2020;
-CNMI PSS was granted a waiver reducing instructional days from 180 to 140 days, or 35 days per quarter;
-CNMI PSS implemented a 4-day work/school week, which limited access to general education personnel;
-CNMI PSS implemented distance learning with limited face-to-face interventions beginning the new school year 2020-2021;
-CNMI PSS implemented an online school registration system, which resulted in issues for students transitioning or transferring to another school at the beginning of school year 2020-2021;
-CNMI Governor's Directive on community lock down due to COVID-19 positive cases in the community affected school operations and the transition to face to face learning.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

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

The CNMI is a unitary educational system responsible for the implementation and supervision of special education and related services to children 3 through 21 years old in 20 public schools on 3 populated islands. The general supervision system includes a monitoring system which allows for the identification and correction of non-compliance in a timely manner and is focused on improved educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. The Monitoring Procedures, updated in May 2011, includes OSEP's Memorandum 09-02 on timely correction of noncompliance, a definition of a "Finding", a description of sanctions that are in line with the Public School System (PSS) Disciplinary Procedures, the timelines and responsible party for the issuance of "Notice of Findings and/or Notice of Failure to Correct" from the Commissioner of Education, the monitoring responsibilities of the external monitor, and revisions to the file review checklist. CNMI PSS also has in place policies and procedures, consistent with IDEA 2004 regulations, to resolve complaints including procedures to resolve complaints through dispute resolution session settlements and mediation agreements.

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 CNMI PSS has a technical assistance system and mechanisms in place to ensure timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based support is provided to improve results for children with disabilities. Over the past few years, the PSS has implemented several system wide initiatives intended to improve results for all students. PSS also accesses and benefits from universal technical assistance provided by OSEP and OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources, either through publications, guidance tools, resource materials, monthly conference calls and webinars, or in person on site assistance through Pacific Learning Collaboratives or other venues. TA Centers such as NCSI for work on the SIMR, IDEA Data Center for evaluating the SSIP plans and high-quality data use, the DaSy Center and ECTA for the collection and analysis of the Early Intervention and Special Education preschool outcomes data, NCEO for inclusion in instruction and assessments, and CIFR for IDEA fiscal requirements related to the maintenance of state financial support. PSS also contracts with the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (Guam CEDDERS) for targeted onsite and offsite technical assistance.

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 children with disabilities.

The CNMI has in place a system for professional development to ensure that service providers, teachers, administrators and school level personnel have the knowledge and skills to effectively provide Special Education services that will result in improved outcomes for children with disabilities and their families. The PSS mechanism requires that all personnel participate in 10 professional development events. Two of the 10 days are statewide professional development, specific to PSS statewide changes and initiatives.

In school year 2020-2021, the office of Student Support Services and the office of Curriculum and Instruction engaged in several focus areas for improvement and included a focus on PD:
• The Office of Curriculum and Instruction continues to provide PD to all elementary schools on the reading curriculum and the essential components of reading.
• Reading and Literacy Coaching is now implemented in all elementary schools. The "Literacy" coaches were provided PD and mentoring on coaching methodologies and strategies.
• In partnership with REL Pacific, PSS is in the process of developing an Early Warning Systems to better identify and target students at risk of not reading proficiently by 3rd grade. The Early warning system will identify struggling students earlier in their school careers, direct students to appropriate interventions, and examine and address on-track patterns among groups of students regularly.

The special education program continues to provide ongoing PD on the evaluation and IEP processes, procedural safeguards, transition requirements, specially designed instruction and appropriate accommodations.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

4

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The parents in the State Advisory Panel are also members of other community or government agency councils that work in partnership with the CNMI PSS and share information to these agencies regarding the delivery of services and outcomes of students with disabilities. These agencies include the Northern Marianas Protection & Advocacy, the Council on Developmental Disabilities, the Council for Living Independently, and the State Rehabilitative Council. Because of their involvement in these various councils, the parent members were able to contribute input, suggest improvement strategies, and understand how to evaluate progress- all of which allowed for active engagement in target setting.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

With the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and CNMI's austerity measures, especially at the beginning of this reporting period, CNMI PSS invested in providing virtual access to all families to ensure that online learning reaches those families in remote areas of the CNMI. Activities included providing internet access in certain areas of the three CNMI islands, laptops for all students, technical support on the use of technology, and if needed portable mifis. Student and family orientation was conducted at all schools to ensure that they were familiar with the technology issued, and able to access the online platform, Blackboard Collaborate.
Other activities include: Saipan Rotary Club presentation on 3/2/2021; Developmental Disabilities Conferences on Saipan, 4/17/2021, Rota, 5/1/2021; Office of Vocational Rehabilitation Outreach- Saipan session, 8/3-6/2021; Family to Family Health Information Center's session to families with children with special health care needs presentation on 8/24/2021.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The CNMI PSS has several sources of soliciting public input. As a member of the CNMI Disabilities Network Partners, the CNMI PSS has always engaged these members not only from the disability community but those that serve as advocates as well. During the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic which resulted in the shutdown of many public and private agencies and offices, meetings and informational sessions shifted to virtual/online, allowing for more participation from interested individuals throughout the community. These meetings and informational sessions included, but are not limited to, PSS Parent Advisory Council (10/9/2021), PSS Youth Advisory Panel (1/19/2022), PSS Board of Education, CNMI Family to Family Health Information Center, CNMI Council on Developmental Disabilities (1/6/2022). Additionally, the CNMI PSS created a social media page to help with outreach efforts in providing information to students, families, and the community. These outlets allowed for information to be shared, reviewed, and to collect input to present to the State Advisory Panel (12/28/2021, 1/6/2022, 1/18/2022) for these purposes.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

Upon successful submission, the PSS will utilize the above mentioned sources to make available the EDEN/EMAPS generated SPP/APR pdf report to the viewing public. Additionally, the report will be available on the CNMI PSS website.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

The CNMI will annually report to the public as soon as practical but no later than 120 days following the submission of the SPP/APR. The CNMI will post the EDEN/EMAPS generated SPP/APR pdf version for public posting and OSEP's Determination Letter and Response Table on the PSS website at https://www.cnmipss.org/special-education-program

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands' IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana received assistance; and (2) the actions the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

OSEP's Part B Determination Letter was issued on June 24, 2021. The CNMI IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. The Department advised CNMI of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required CNMI to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed CNMI to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. CNMI must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana received assistance; and (2) the actions the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana took as a result of that technical assistance.

1. Technical assistance received: CNMI continues to work with regional technical assistance providers, such as University of Guam CEDDERS and McREL Pacific, and national OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, such as the National Center on Systemic Improvement, (NCSI) to support CNMI's system improvements that focus on the results indicators, specifically Indicators 3, 5 and 6.

2. Actions CNMI took as a result of the technical assistance: With the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and CNMI's austerity measures, especially at the beginning of this reporting period, access to technical assistance has been primarily through virtual engagement, including virtual sessions with the special education and early childhood teachers. CNMI participated in the monthly NCSI calls to address some of the issues related to distance learning. In June 2021, a full-day professional development for all special education personnel was held to review the outcomes and to celebrate the successes of school year 2020-2021. This was the first full-day in-person professional development since the March 2020 COVID-19 shutdown of schools and/or increased travel restrictions.

Intro - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' (CNMI's) determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed CNMI that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which CNMI received assistance; and (2) the actions CNMI took as a result of that technical assistance. CNMI provided the required information.

The Department imposed Specific Conditions on the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	76.39%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	76.00%	78.00%		80.00%	80.00%
Data	80.00%	82.00%	76.39%	89.86%	90.77%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	64

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
64	67	90.77%	80.00%	95.52%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

As an outlying area, CNMI does not report graduation data to the Department under ESEA Title 1. The graduation conditions in the CNMI is based on the approved CNMI Board of Education credit requirements. In school year 2005-2006, the BOE revised the graduation requirements, Policy 60-20-434, from 21 credits to 28 credits (23 credits for required subjects and 5 elective credits) to receive a high school diploma. The credit requirements for graduating with a high school diploma also apply to students with disabilities.

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2008	9.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	7.46%	8.78%	5.07%	2.17%	1.86%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the

Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	64
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	3

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

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

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

The CNMI uses an event rate of calculating dropout data which is the incidence of students who drop out in a single year without completing high school compared to the student enrollment in grades 9 to 12 for that school year (618 exit data and high school enrollment).

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs enrolled in high school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	306	1.86%	2.00%	0.98%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Definition
The CNMI uses the OSEP 618 definition for "Dropped Out" which states the total number of students who were enrolled at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period and did not exit through any other method. This includes dropouts, runaways, GED recipients, expulsions, status unknown, students who moved and are unknown to be continuing in another educational program, and students exiting the system in other ways. This method of collecting dropout data is consistent for all students.

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

> A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
>
> B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
>
> C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
>
> D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	92.59%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	85.07%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	65.22%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	97.53%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	92.54%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	63.04%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	92.59%	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	85.07%	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	65.22%	65.00%	71.00%	79.00%	87.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	97.53%	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	92.54%	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	63.04%	63.00%	71.00%	79.00%	87.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	81	67	46
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	64	50	21
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	11	7	9

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	81	67	46
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	68	55	20
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	11	7	9

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	75	81		92.59%	92.59%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	57	67		85.07%	85.07%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	30	46		65.22%	65.22%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	79	81		97.53%	97.53%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	62	67		92.54%	92.54%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	29	46		63.04%	63.04%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

https://www.cnmipss.org/special-education-program

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

CNMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. CNMI did not provide a target for FFY 2020, as required.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	9.38%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	8.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	4.76%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	7.35%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	5.45%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	15.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	9.38%	9.00%	12.00%	15.00%	18.00%	21.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	8.00%	8.00%	11.00%	14.00%	17.00%	20.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	4.76%	5.00%	8.00%	11.00%	14.00%	17.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	7.35%	7.00%	10.00%	13.00%	16.00%	19.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.45%	5.00%	8.00%	11.00%	14.00%	17.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	15.00%	15.00%	18.00%	21.00%	24.00%	27.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not

demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	64	50	21
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6	4	1

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	68	55	20
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5	3	3

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6	64		9.38%	9.38%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	4	50		8.00%	8.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1	21		4.76%	4.76%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5	68		7.35%	7.35%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	3	55		5.45%	5.45%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3	20		15.00%	15.00%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

https://www.cnmipss.org/special-education-program

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

CNMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. CNMI did not provide a target for FFY 2020, as required.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

      A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

      B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

      C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

      D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	27.27%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	85.71%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	44.44%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	36.36%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	85.71%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	55.56%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	27.27%	27.00%	30.00%	30.00%	33.00%	33.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	85.71%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	88.00%	88.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	44.44%	44.00%	47.00%	47.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	36.36%	36.00%	39.00%	39.00%	42.00%	42.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	85.71%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	88.00%	88.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	55.56%	55.00%	58.00%	58.00%	61.00%	61.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	11	7	9
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	3	6	4

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	11	7	9
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	4	6	5

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3	11		27.27%	27.27%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	6	7		85.71%	85.71%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4	9		44.44%	44.44%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4	11		36.36%	36.36%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	6	7		85.71%	85.71%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	5	9		55.56%	55.56%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

https://www.cnmipss.org/special-education-program

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

CNMI has revised baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. CNMI did not provide a target for FFY 2020, as required.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

>   A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

>   B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

>   C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

>   D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	35.66
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	26.03
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	33.11
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	30.26
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	30.36
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	51.94

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	35.66	36.00	33.00	30.00	27.00	24.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	26.03	26.00	23.00	20.00	17.00	14.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	33.11	33.00	30.00	27.00	24.00	21.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	30.26	30.00	27.00	24.00	21.00	18.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.36	30.00	27.00	24.00	21.00	18.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	51.94	52.00	49.00	46.00	43.00	40.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	675	667	499
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	64	50	21
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	298	223	188
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6	4	1
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6	4	1

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	678	673	602
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	68	55	20
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	250	238	400
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5	3	3
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5	3	3

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9.38%	45.04%		35.66	35.66	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8.00%	34.03%		26.03	26.03	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	4.76%	37.88%		33.11	33.11	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7.35%	37.61%		30.26	30.26	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5.45%	35.81%		30.36	30.36	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	15.00%	66.94%		51.94	51.94	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

CNMI has established baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. CNMI must provide FFY 2020 targets for this indicator.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

> B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2008	2.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

Significant Discrepancy Definition: In its FFY 2007 APR, CNMI submitted the revised significant discrepancy definition of "0% difference between the two groups" – students without disabilities and students with disabilities, which went into effect in FFY 2008. In December 2014, the stakeholders revised the definition of significant discrepancy to read a difference of more than 1% between the two groups.

Methodology: CNMI is a unitary system and therefore uses the comparison methodology between students without disabilities and students with disabilities to determine if there exists a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year.

Using one year data lag, the reported data used for FFY 2020 Indicator 4A was from 2019-2020 as follows:
-Students without disabilities = 0.03% (3/9005)
-Students with disabilities = 0% (0/949) - consistent with the 618 discipline data submitted in November 2020
-Difference = 0.03%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

> A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

> B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

> --The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 4B does not apply to the CNMI.

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

    A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

    B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

    C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

    A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

    B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

    C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	85.00%
A	88.54%	Data	84.87%	82.16%	83.69%	84.58%	87.31%
B	2020	Target <=	4.60%	4.40%	4.20%	4.00%	3.00%
B	1.67%	Data	2.14%	2.04%	2.74%	2.10%	1.49%
C	2020	Target <=	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%
C	0.11%	Data	0.00%	0.12%	0.60%	0.58%	0.23%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	88.54%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	89.00%
Target B <=	1.67%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	1.00%
Target C <=	0.11%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	899
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	796
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	796	899	87.31%	88.54%	88.54%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15	899	1.49%	1.67%	1.67%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1	899	0.23%	0.11%	0.11%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

CNMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. CNMI did not provide a target for FFY 2020, as required.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

> C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

> A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

> B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

> C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	86.00%
A	Data	83.87%	85.87%	87.07%	78.70%	62.82%
B	Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	43.04%
B	2020	0.00%
C	2020	56.96%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	43.04%	43.00%	43.00%	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	56.96%	57.00%	57.00%	55.00%	50.00%	45.00%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	23	39	17	79
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	7	15	12	34
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	16	24	5	45

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	34	79	62.82%	43.04%	43.04%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	79	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	45	79		56.96%	56.96%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

CNMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. CNMI did not provide a target for FFY 2020, as required.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	92.50%	93.50%	95.00%	96.50%	96.50%
A1	96.00%	Data	83.33%	75.00%	100.00%	89.47%	100.00%
A2	2008	Target >=	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	57.00%

A2	37.00%	Data	68.75%	68.09%	39.02%	39.13%	51.43%
B1	2008	Target >=	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B1	100.00%	Data	90.63%	62.50%	97.44%	91.30%	96.97%
B2	2008	Target >=	30.00%	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%	31.00%
B2	22.00%	Data	46.88%	31.91%	19.51%	13.04%	25.71%
C1	2008	Target >=	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%	96.50%	96.50%
C1	96.20%	Data	95.24%	59.26%	100.00%	89.74%	100.00%
C2	2008	Target >=	71.50%	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	72.50%
C2	44.40%	Data	68.75%	59.57%	41.46%	36.96%	57.14%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	96.50%
Target A2 >=	33.00%	33.00%	33.00%	33.00%	33.00%	38.00%
Target B1 >=	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	100.00%
Target B2 >=	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	20.00%	25.00%	30.00%
Target C1 >=	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	97.00%
Target C2 >=	43.00%	43.00%	45.00%	45.00%	46.00%	48.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

39

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	5.13%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	24	61.54%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	15.38%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7	17.95%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	30	32	100.00%	93.00%	93.75%	Met target	No Slippage
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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	13	39	51.43%	33.00%	33.33%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.56%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	32	82.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5	12.82%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.56%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	37	38	96.97%	97.00%	97.37%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	6	39	25.71%	15.00%	15.38%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.56%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	21	53.85%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	15.38%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	11	28.21%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	27	28	100.00%	96.00%	96.43%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	17	39	57.14%	43.00%	43.59%	Met target	No Slippage

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

The Child Outcome Summary (COS) process consists of four key features of quality. These features include:

1. Using information from multiple sources. The process produces a description of the child's functioning at a single point in time by synthesizing multiple sources of information. Multiple source of information is used to determine the status of the COS. Most of the information needed is already collected as part of the development of the child's IEP and therefore, collecting child assessment information is currently part of the IEP development process and is not an added step. Multiple sources of information are used to make decisions regarding the child's performance related to the three child outcomes.

Data sources include:
o The Hawaii Early Learning Profile
o Other assessment results if appropriate
o Parent and other caregiver information
o Child observations
o Early Childhood Special Education Service provider observations and input

2. Relying on team-based discussion and team decision making. This approach is a team process, involving professionals and family members contributing to decision-making. The COS process is designed to be a team consensus process where each individual member contributes information about the child's functioning across a variety of setting and situations. The members of the team participate collectively in a discussion to determine the child's rating. The child's family is an important member of the COS team. The family provides critical information about the child. The family may not be familiar with the COS process but they are experts on what their child is doing across settings and situations. The team shall include family members, professionals who work with the child, and others familiar with the child's functioning such as child care providers. Teams can range in size from two people to as many the parent and team feels is needed.

3. Using a 7-point rating scale to describe the child's function across settings and situations. The process involves team members using the information gathered about a child to rate his or her functioning in each of the three outcome areas on a 7-point scale. Using the 7-point rating scale requires the team to compare the child's skills and behaviors with those expected for his or her age. The purpose of the rating is to document current functioning. The COS process results in a rating for each of the three child outcomes. The rating is based on child's functioning across settings and situations. A child's functioning is compared with what is expected for a child at that age. The rating reflects the child's functioning at each of the time points and should be determined as close to the actual entry and exit as possible. The comparison of entry to exit ratings provides information about the child's progress. Ratings on all three outcomes must be reported for every child enrolled. Ratings are needed in all areas even if: 1) No one has concerns about a child's development, and 2) A child has delays in one or two outcome areas, but not in all three outcome areas. The ECO Decision Tree is a helpful tool for facilitating the rating process and guides the team through the process for each outcome.

4. Completing the COS forms upon program entry and exit. The COS process is completed at two points in time, at a minimum--when the child enters the program and when the child exits the program.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	78.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data	90.07%	91.34%	92.31%	93.53%	

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
140	152		90.00%	92.11%	Met target	N/A

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, an online version of the survey was developed for all parents to complete. A paper version of the survey was also made available. Emails were sent to the parents with the online survey link. Follow-up emails and phone calls were conducted to remind parents to complete the survey and that a paper version of the survey was available.

For preschoolers with disabilities, 15 surveys were completed via online and no paper copies were completed. This represents a 14.71% (15/102) response rate from parents of preschoolers with an IEP.

For school-age children with disabilities, a total of 165 surveys were completed; of which, 120 were via the online survey and 45 were the paper version. This represents a 18.11% (165/911) response rate from parents of school-age children with disabilities.

It should be noted that although a combined total of 180 surveys were returned, 152 surveys included valid responses to the items that provided the FFY 2020 performance data for Indicator 8. This included 12 surveys completed by parents of preschoolers with disabilities and 140 surveys completed by parents of school-age children with disabilities. Invalid surveys represented 15.56% (28/180) of the total surveys returned.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.
1,013
Percentage of respondent parents
15.00%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate		15.00%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The PSS Parent Advisory Council (PAC) comprised of PTSA presidents of elementary, middle, and high schools whose purpose is to present issues and concerns from their respective PTSA councils to the PSS Leadership, and for PSS Leadership to share information to the PAC for dissemination to PTSAs. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the PAC meeting had to shift to virtual meetings, allowing for an increase in parent participation from various socio-economic backgrounds as meetings were more accessible. This recent transition to virtual PAC meetings will be used as a platform to share and receive information from parents, and ensure those from all three islands are represented.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Although CNMI reported a low response rate in FFY 2020, an analysis of the respondents indicated a cross section of parents did respond. All islands were represented, with the majority of surveys received from the island of Saipan, the largest of the three CNMI islands. Of the 20 CNMI schools, 85% (17/20) were represented in the number of surveys collected.

Making the survey available via online, with printed copies upon request, appeared to respond to the concerns related to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the low response rate indicated that CNMI needs to ensure that parents understand the purpose of the online survey. Internet and technology access were made available to all families but the survey dissemination would need additional awareness activiites or virtual sessions to

review its purpose. The CNMI will work with the various parent groups, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), and the PSS PAC to support this dissemination efforts to promote increased responses from parents of children with disabilities.

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

The parent survey included ethnicity and geographic location for parents to respond to. A total of 163 surveys included the demographic data related to ethnicity. The two highest responses included the ethnicity categories of Pacific Islander at 61.96% (101/163) and Asian at 32.52% (53/163). The December 1, 2020 Child Count ethnicity categories, the ethnicity of Pacific Islanders reported 59.92% (586/978) and Asian at 25.77% (252/978) for children and youth with an IEP, which were slightly below the survey respondent selected ethnicity categories. It should be noted that the parent survey did not include the "two or more races" category, which may have contributed to a slight increase in percentages for the two major ethnicity categories reported by the survey respondents.

As mentioned earlier, an analysis of the respondents indicated a cross section of parents did respond. All islands were represented, with the majority of surveys received from the island of Saipan, the largest of the three CNMI islands. Of the 20 CNMI schools, 85% (17/20) were represented in the number of surveys collected.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Making the survey available via online, with printed copies upon request, appeared to respond to the concerns related to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the low response rate indicated that CNMI needs to ensure that parents understand the purpose of the online survey. Internet and technology access were made available to all families but the survey dissemination would need additional awareness activities or virtual sessions to review its purpose. The CNMI will work with the various parent groups, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), and the PSS PAC to support this dissemination efforts to promote increased responses from parents of children with disabilities.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

As described earlier, the analysis of the respondents indicated a cross section of parent respondents. All islands were represented, with the majority of surveys received from the island of Saipan, the largest of the three CNMI islands. Of the 20 CNMI schools, 85% (17/20) were represented in the number of surveys collected. As described earlier, based on the ethnicity data gathered in the survey and the data of CNMI's Child Count ethnicity data, the metric of +/-3% showed that the ethnicity of Asian was over-represented at 6.75%. However, as noted, there needs to be a caution in using this analysis because the ethnicity category of "two or more races" was not included as an item in the survey for parents to choose. The category of "two or more races" is one of the ethnicity categories for the Child Count data collection.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP notes that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, CNMI did not submit FFY 2019 data for this indicator in its FFY 2019 SPP/APR. Therefore, CNMI was not able to compare the response rates for FFY 2019 and FFY 2020.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 9 does not apply to CNMI.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Per OSEP's instructions, Indicator 10 does not apply to CNMI.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	53.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.45%	97.96%	99.11%	96.53%	94.16%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
175	161	94.16%	100%	92.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

CNMI reported slippage by 2.16% from 94.16% (129/137) in FFY 2019 to 92% (161/175) in FFY 2020. The reasons for the slippage were due to nonadherence to procedures. A contributing factor to this nonadherence could be that schools shifting to a "blended" learning model, a combination of face-to-face and online learning. This shift in the number of days that students were on campus required a coordinated scheduling effort by all evaluators.

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

14

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

The 14 initial evaluations accounted for under (a) but not included in (b) were from four elementary schools (GTC, OES, SVS, WSR), two high schools (MHS and SSHS), and one private school. All 14 initial evaluations were completed, with 4 not eligible for special education services. The days beyond the 60-day timeline ranged from four days to 116 days.

The reasons for delay were non-adherence to procedures. It should be noted that the impact of COVID-19 resulted in schools shifting to a "blended" learning model, a combination of face-to-face and online learning, which could have contributed to the procedural noncompliance.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The data for this indicator is taken from the database of all children for whom a consent for initial evaluation was received for the report period of July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021. The Data Manager logs the referral information into the database which generates the time requirements (60 days from receipt of the parent consent). The Data Manager sends out the referral information to the schools and providers responsible for the evaluation. Upon completion of evaluations, the reports are sent to the data manager to input into the database. The database is formatted to "flag" any date over the 60-day timeline. For all red flags, a Reason for Delay form is required. The Data Manager, in consultation with the Special Education Director and Compliance Monitor, designates a determination of valid or invalid reasons for delay, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(d).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8		0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected through a review of updated data of actual initial evaluation documents from the six schools that received the Written Notice of Findings for the eight individual instances of noncompliance. As described in the FFY 2019 for Indicator 11, the eight individual instances of noncompliance were completed. To verify correction, updated data of actual initial evaluation documents were submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the State data system. In FFY 2020, the review of the actual initial evaluation documents resulted in the six schools determined to have verified timely correction of the initial evaluation regulatory requirement with the updated data demonstrating 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement. These additional initial evaluations from the six schools demonstrating 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement confirmed that these schools were correctly implementing the 60-day initial evaluation regulatory requirement, resulting in the six schools receiving a Written Notice of Timely Correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

As documented in the FFY 2019 performance data for Indicator 11, the eight initial evaluations from six schools were not completed in a timely manner. These schools were issued a Written Notice of Findings because the initial evaluations were not completed within the 60-day timeline. Although late, all instances of noncompliance were verified to be completed through a review of actual initial evaluation documents submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, as reported in FFY 2019 for Indicator 11. In addition, through a review of updated data of actual initial evaluations submitted to the PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the six schools demonstrated 100% compliance with the updated data of initial evaluations demonstrating 100% verified timely correction and received a Written Notice of Timely Correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected through a review of updated data of actual initial evaluation documents from the six schools that received the Written Notice of Findings for the eight individual instances of noncompliance. As described in the FFY 2019 for Indicator 11, the eight individual instances of noncompliance were completed. To verify correction, updated data of actual initial evaluation documents were submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the State data system. In FFY 2020, the review of the actual initial evaluation documents resulted in the six schools determined to have verified timely correction of the initial evaluation regulatory requirement with the updated data demonstrating 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement. These additional initial evaluations from the six schools demonstrating 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement confirmed that these schools were correctly implementing the 60-day initial evaluation regulatory requirement, resulting in the six schools receiving a Written Notice of Timely Correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

      a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

      b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

      c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

      d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

      e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

      f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	96.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	47
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	5

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	31
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	11
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	31	31	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

0

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Data used to report in this indicator was taken from the database and verified in the child's IEP folder. The Early Intervention Program submits a monthly listing of Part C children who will be three (3) years old during the year and who are potentially eligible for Part B services. The Early Childhood Special Education (EC-SPED) team attends all Transition Conferences of children potentially eligible for Special Education. During the Transition Conference, the EC-SPED team plans and schedules with parents the potential dates to begin the Part B evaluation and IEP process. The EC-SPED team is responsible to ensure procedural safeguard requirements are followed (Prior Written Notice provided to the parent and parental consent to evaluate is obtained prior to the evaluation). If the child is determined eligible for special education, parental consent is obtained prior to the development and implementation of initial services and placement. The EC-SPED team submits the timeline data (date of Consent to Evaluate, date of Consent for Initial IEP, and IEP implementation date) to the data manager. The data manager logs the information into the database and verifies the dates with the documents. The database is formatted to "flag" untimely IEP's by third birthday. Allowable delays are parent refusal to consent to the initial evaluation or refusal to consent to the initial IEP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	77.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.18%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
214	214	83.18%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The Data Manager uses the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) checklist to review all IEP's of 16 year olds to verify the survey results and to ensure the surveys reflect students who are at least 16 years old and above and that there were no duplicate counts. The data is collected from each IEP and inputted on an excel sheet created by the Data Manager as a component of the State data base.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
37	37		0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected through a review of updated data of actual IEP documents from the three high schools that received the Written Notice of Findings for the 37 individual instances of noncompliance with Indicator 13 requirements. To verify correction, updated data of actual IEP documents were submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the State data system. The review of the actual IEP documents resulted in the three high schools determined to have verified correction of the Indicator 13 secondary transition regulatory requirements with the updated data demonstrating 100% compliance with the secondary transition requirements, which is reflected in the 100% (214/214) compliance reported in the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 13 data.

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

All instances of noncompliance were verified to be corrected through a review of actual IEP documents submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected through a review of updated data of actual IEP documents from the three high schools that received the Written Notice of Findings for the 37 individual instances of noncompliance with Indicator 13 requirements. To verify correction, updated data of actual IEP documents were submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the State data system. The review of the actual IEP documents resulted in the three high schools determined to have verified correction of the Indicator 13 secondary transition regulatory requirements with the updated data demonstrating 100% compliance with the secondary transition requirements, which is reflected in the 100% (214/214) compliance reported in the FFY 2020 APR Indicator 13 data.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: 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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. *Definitions*

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment":

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

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. *Data Reporting*

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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

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

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*
Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

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

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target >=	16.00%	18.00%	19.00%	20.00%	20.00%
A	10.00%	Data	16.98%	10.17%	12.24%	16.13%	8.62%
B	2009	Target >=	55.00%	58.00%	61.00%	63.00%	63.00%
B	62.00%	Data	37.74%	61.02%	48.98%	72.58%	56.90%
C	2009	Target >=	69.00%	75.00%	81.00%	87.00%	87.00%
C	86.00%	Data	43.40%	64.41%	61.22%	75.81%	63.79%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	17.00%	17.00%	18.00%	18.00%	19.00%	20.00%
Target B >=	40.00%	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	55.00%	62.10%
Target C >=	40.00%	45.00%	45.00%	60.00%	70.00%	86.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	67
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	47
Response Rate	70.15%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	8
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	11
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	0
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

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	8	47	8.62%	17.00%	17.02%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	19	47	56.90%	40.00%	40.43%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	19	47	63.79%	40.00%	40.43%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	89.23%	70.15%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The CNMI PSS will continue to utilize the Post-School Outcome survey to collect and report data for this indicator. Each school year special education teachers notify students as well as parents or guardians that the student will be contacted for post school interview one year from leaving high school to see if they have met their goals. During the school year, special education teachers ensure that contact information is updated and current prior to students exiting. Beginning in the spring of each year, school teams make contact with the exiters or their families (possibly siblings, relatives, etc.) from the previous year to conduct the post-school survey. Surveys are gathered and submitted to the Data and Compliance Program Manager for review to ensure that all sections have been completed correctly and accounted for all exiters.

The CNMI PSS continues to collaborate with its community partner agencies through the Disability Network Partners as well as other PSS programs to promote, educate and share resources that will enable and expand career and technical education pathways for post-secondary.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Overall, CNMI reported a response rate of 70.15% (47/67), with the response rate by demographics ranging from 66.67% (28/42) for the disability type of Learning Disabilities (LD) to 72.43% (15/21) for the female respondents to 82.35% (14/17) for the disability type of AO (All Other Disabilities). In addition, by exit categories, the response rates include 70.31% (45/64) for graduates with a high school diploma and 66.67% (2/3) for those who dropped out. The overall and by demographic response rates are an indication of CNMI's reported representativeness of the Respondent Group with the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2019-2020, considered the Leaver Group.

CNMI also reviewed the geographic locations of the Leaver Group and Respondent Group. Geographic location included the three islands of CNMI: Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. There were two Leavers from Tinian and three from Rota. The respondent group included all leavers from Tinian and Rota. The difference in the leaver group and respondent group from Saipan was -3.18%, which showed a slight under-representation. The outreach in the CNMI has been to ensure that services and supports are provided to the smaller islands of Tinian and Rota. Gathering all information from the leavers from these island communities is significant.

Using the metric for determining representation, as described below, increased awareness for CNMI to provide outreach activities even on Saipan, the largest island in the CNMI.

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

Overall, CNMI reported a response rate of 70.15% (47/67), with the response rate by demographics ranging from 66.67% (28/42) for the disability type of Learning Disabilities (LD) to 72.43% (15/21) for the female respondents to 82.35% (14/17) for the disability type of AO (All Other Disabilities). In addition, by exit categories, the response rates include 70.31% (45/64) for graduates with a high school diploma and 66.67% (2/3) for those who dropped out. The overall and by demographic response rates are an indication of CNMI's reported representativeness of the Respondent Group with the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2019-2020, considered the Leaver Group.

In addition, CNMI reviewed the geographic locations of the Leaver Group and Respondent Group. Geographic location included the three islands of CNMI: Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. There were two Leavers from Tinian and three from Rota. The respondent group included all leavers from Tinian and Rota. The difference in the leaver group and respondent group from Saipan was -3.18%, which showed a slight under-representation. The outreach in the CNMI has been to ensure that services and supports are provided to the smaller islands of Tinian and Rota. Gathering all information from the leavers from these island communities is significant.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

CNMI used the NPSO Response Calculator to calculate the response rate by demographic categories and representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of: (a) disability type, (b) gender, and (c) exit status (e.g., dropout) to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to, or different from, the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2019-2020, the one-year lag data for reporting post-school outcomes data in FFY 2020.

Overall, CNMI reported a response rate of 70.15% (47/67), with the response rate by demographics ranging from 66.67% (28/42) for the disability type of Learning Disabilities (LD) to 72.43% (15/21) for the female respondents to 82.35% (14/17) for the disability type of AO (All Other Disabilities). In addition, by exit categories, the response rates include 70.31% (45/64) for graduates with a high school diploma and 66.67% (2/3) for those who dropped out. The overall and by demographic response rates are an indication of CNMI's reported representativeness of the Respondent Group with the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2019-2020, considered the Leaver Group.

According to the NPSO Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Leaver Group of ±3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. The NPSO Response Rates and Nonresponse Bias guidance was also reviewed to determine if the differences were significant enough to identify non-representativeness. Understanding the differences between the respondent group and leave group are important, but it has to be in relation to other information, especially within the context of a small population. In the NPSO Response Calculator, a difference exceeding a ±3% interval indicates under- or over-representation.

The characteristics that calculated a difference exceeding ±3% included disability type of LD at -3.12% (under-represented) and AO at +4.42% (over-represented). To keep within the ±3% interval for these characteristics, they would have required at least one more respondent for LD and one less respondent for AO. The other characteristics of disability type of Emotional Disabilities (ED) and Intellectual Disabilities (ID); gender of female; and exit status of dropout did not calculate a difference exceeding ±3%. Another factor considered in determining representativeness was the response rate for these demographic categories. For the disability type of LD, the response rate was 66.67% (28/42), and the AO disability type had an 82.35% (14/17) response rate.

In addition, CNMI reviewed the geographic locations of the Leaver Group and Respondent Group. Geographic location included the three islands of CNMI: Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. There were two Leavers from Tinian and three from Rota. The respondent group included all leavers from Tinian and Rota. The difference in the leaver group and respondent group from Saipan was -3.18%, which showed a slight under-representation. The outreach in the CNMI has been to ensure that services and supports are provided to the smaller islands of Tinian and Rota. Gathering all information from the leavers from these island communities is significant.

Based on the NPSO Response Calculator and other information related to the respondent and leaver groups, CNMI stakeholders determined that the respondent group data for FFY 2020 is representative of the total leaver group.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

The CNMI reported that there were no resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. Per OSEP's instruction, the CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

CNMI reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

The CNMI reported that there were no mediations held in FFY 2020. Per OSEP's instruction, the CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					

Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

CNMI reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

<u>Baseline Data</u>: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

<u>Targets</u>: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

<u>Updated Data:</u> In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A.   Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B.   Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. 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. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C.   Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

By June 30, 2026, at least 39% of 3rd grade students with an IEP in the elementary schools will perform at or above reading proficiency against grade level and alternate academic achievement.

Year 1 (FFY 2020) – SIMR reflects data from the three target schools.
Year 2 & 3 (FFY 2021 & FFY 2022) : CNMI will include fidelity data from the scale-up schools (i.e., the remaining six elementary schools).
Year 4, 5, & 6 (FFY 2023, FFY 2024, & FFY 2025) : CNMI will include fidelity and proficiency data for all elementary schools (the three target schools and the scale-up schools.)

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

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

The CNMI PSS had changed its summative assessment from the ACT Aspire to the Renaissance STAR Reading. Due to the change, the 4th screening administered in May for STAR Reading was used as the outcome data for all students. The outcome data for students with an IEP for SY20-21 was used as the baseline for this reporting period.   The team reviewed the data and proposed targets for all students as part of the PSS's consolidated grant application and there was consensus to align the SiMR with the PSS's methodology for setting targets for all students for the next five years with the goal of closing the gap between all students and students with an IEP.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

The SSIP Core Team reviewed the data from the Renaissance STAR Reading for all students and disaggregated data for students with an IEP. The team also reviewed the proposed targets for all students.

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

The SSIP Core team reviewed the SY20-21 outcome data for all 3rd graders and the SY21-22 target as outlined in the CNMI's consolidated grant. The PSS established a target of a 3% increase each year for the next five years for all students. To align with the proposed target for the general education population, the team agreed to close the gap between the performance of all students and students with an IEP by increasing the target every year by at least 3%. The outcome data for SY20-21 was used as the baseline data for this SSIP cycle.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

Input was solicited on the current SiMR and a discussion was held to determine if there was a need to change. The stakeholders consisted of members of the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), SSIP Core Team Members (District and school administrators), and school personnel.   The stakeholders provided input on the SiMR as a result to the change in the summative assessment as well as proposed targets for years two through five.

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.

The CNMI is using 3rd graders for the SiMR based on risk factors associated if a student is not reading by 3rd grade.

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

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

1. Additional components under Leadership strand:
a.   Early Warning System (EWS) for grades K-3rd
IF PSS establishes an Early Warning System (EWS) in grades K-3rd, THEN teachers will identify students at risk for not meeting benchmarks, THEN students will be provided academic and behavioral supports to meet their needs.
b. High-Dosage Tutoring
IF PSS implements High-Dosage Tutoring to supplement core instruction, THEN core instruction will be supplemented because of COVD-19, THEN students will "accelerate their learning in an individualized manner (CNMI High-Dosage Manual)."

2. Additional component under Professional Development Strand:
a.   Social-Emotional Learning: IF PSS provides professional development in social-emotional learning, THEN teachers and other school personnel will meet the social and emotional needs students experience due to COVID-19 and other trauma, THEN students will increase engagement and performance in school.
b.   Early Warning System (EWS): IF PSS provides professional development in the implementation of the Early Warning System (EWS), THEN teachers and other school personnel will identify students in need of supplemental supports in literacy, THEN students will increase achievement in literacy.
c.   High-Dosage Tutoring: IF PSS provides professional development in the delivery of High-Dosage Tutoring, THEN teachers and other support personnel will meet the literacy needs of the students, THEN there will be an increase in the number of students passing their classes.

3. Additional component under the Collaboration Strand:

a.   Family Supports and Increased Partnership with Parents
IF PSS provides increased family supports and increases partnerships with parents in literacy, THEN parents will increase engagement in activities critical to improving students' performance in literacy and support their child's literacy program, THEN students will increase growth in literacy.
b. Student Support Services (SSS) and Office of Curriculum and Instruction (OCI)
IF SSS and OCI increases collaboration and alignment to support the literacy program, THEN resources will be provided to support the needs of school personnel and families, THEN students with IEPs will be provided supports in the home and in the schools.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://www.cnmipss.org/sites/default/files/cnmi_b_toa_2022_508_compliant_0.pdf

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

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

For this reporting period, changes have been made to the strategies under the respective key strand. The description for the specific strategies is provided in the section on changes to the Theory of Action and in the section on summary of improvement strategies implemented for the FFY2020.

1. Governance/Leadership
a.   Establishment of an Early Warning System (EWS) to identify students in need of academic and behavioral supports and provide needed interventions in a timely manner to increase and maintain learning gains.
b. Implementation of High Dosage Tutoring to mitigate learning loss because of COVID-19.

2. Professional Development
Professional development activities were provided related to implementation of EWS, social emotional learning, and high dosage tutoring. These activities were necessary to implement programs and services to mitigate learning loss and increase proficiency in literacy.

3. Collaboration
Family Supports and Increased Partnerships with Families – This was critical as the PSS students were transitioning back and forth between in-person and remote learning. For remote learning at home, it was essential to engage parents in the delivery of instruction.

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)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
FFY 2020	26.92%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	26.00%	27.00%	30.00%	33.00%	36.00%	39.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

# of 3rd Graders with an IEP in the Three Target Schools who scored At or Above Proficient in Reading	# of 3rd Graders with an IEP in the Three Target Schools with Valid Scores in Reading	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
7	26		26.00%	26.92%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

For SY20-21, the CNMI Public School System (PSS) adopted the Renaissance STAR Reading (k-3) as the assessment for measuring end of the year outcomes and the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

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

The data is collected by school and disaggregated by subgroups and then summarized for the three target schools. The data for the SIMR are analyzed for the proficiency rate by identifying the percentage of 3rd grade students with an IEP performing at or above the benchmark standard score for the 3rd grade as measured by the Renaissance STAR Reading and determined proficient as measured by the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS).

The data collected included the 3rd grade IEP students with valid scores in the three SSIP target schools. The numerator of "7" represented those 3rd grade IEP students with a valid score in the three SSIP target schools who scored at the proficient level in reading as measured by the Renaissance

STAR Reading and AA-AAS. The denominator of "26" represented the total number of 3rd grade IEP students with a valid score in the three target schools.

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 PSS conducts three benchmark screenings annually. For this reporting period, the Fall screening was conducted form August 29 – September 13, 2021. The Winter screening was scheduled for November 29 – December 20, 2021 but was cancelled due to the transition to remote learning as a result of increased positive cases. The benchmark screening data are used to determine the type and intensity of intervention to be provided.

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)
YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.
The chronology of transition of instruction from in-person to blended learning is described below which affected the participation and proficiency data for all students including students with an IEP.

SY20-21 2nd Semester:
• Blended Learning based on cohorts
• Monday – online (All Students)
• Tuesday/Thursday: Face-to-Face (In-person) – Cohort A
• Wednesday/Friday: (Face-to-Face (In-person) – Cohort B
• Cohort A – Asynchronous on Wed/Fri, Cohort B – Asynchronous on Tues/Thurs

SY21-22
August 18, 2021 - 1st day of instruction
October 29, 2021 - Closure of all schools by the CNMI Governor – Instruction switched to online
Schools allowed to resume in-person instruction based on testing (SVS- 11/29 to 12/6; WSR – 12/1 – 12/3; GES – 12/2 – 12/3)
12/5/21 – Closure of non-essential government offices for the next ten days – 12/6 – 12/19
12/6/21 – 12/23/21 (last day of classes prior to Christmas vacation) Transition to remote learning
Jan.3, 2022 – Resume to in-person instruction

Impact on Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessment
Due to the need to constantly change the mode of delivery of instruction, attendance was not consistent for all students. During benchmark screening or outcome assessment dates or other in-person activities, some parents were reluctant to allow their child to attend school for fear of contracting COVID-19. Screening #2 was cancelled due to return to remote learning. To mitigate this impact, the school personnel increased communication with families as well as increased collaboration between the units of the education agency.

Impact on Observation of Instruction
For this reporting period, observation was limited to 1x/year due to the number of teachers. The amount of time observed was limited to 30 minutes. During the period of observation for this reporting period, the PSS schools were fully remote. For at least one of the SSIP target schools, the observation was limited to the 3rd -5th grade classrooms receiving instruction remotely as the instruction for K-2nd grade students was limited to paper-based learning packets. Therefore, the observation data was limited to 3rd grade classrooms. Without the ability to observe for the complete English/Language Arts (ELA) period for the teachers, it was difficult to determine if the components to be observed were being implemented. To mitigate the impact, school administrators shared in the responsibility of observing the teachers for implementation of the Journey's curriculum and the foundations of reading with fidelity.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.
https://www.cnmipss.org/sites/default/files/cnmissipevaluationplanworksheet_508_compliant_0.pdf

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

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.
The changes to the SSIP evaluation plan were necessary due to the additional strategies included for this reporting period. The changes are as follows:
1. To measure fidelity and impact of the establishment of the Early Warning System for grades Kinder through 3 student reading outcomes.
2. To evaluate Impact of the implementation of a High Dosage Tutoring program to address learning loss because of COVID-19 in addressing the loss and impact on student reading outcomes
3.To evaluate impact of additional Family Supports/Partnerships with families on families and student reading outcomes.

There were two new strategies added under the Governance/Leadership and one under the Collaboration strand respectively.

Strand (Infrastructure): Governance/Leadership

Strategy: Implementation of Early Warning System (EWS) in grades K to 3rd?
A.3 Evaluation Question: What are overall impacts for implementing and Early Warning System for grades K-3?
(14) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of students exhibiting academic and behavior at-risk performance are identified and provided interventions to

improve reading performance.
SHORT-TERM OUTCOME: District and school personnel increase knowledge and skills in identifying students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: Teachers and other school personnel identify students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
LONG-TERM OUTCOME: Students demonstrate grade level reading skills mastery.

A.3.1 Evaluation Question: To what extent is the Early Warning System (EWS) implemented in grades K to 3rd?
(15) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of elementary schools are participating in the EWS.
SHORT-TERM OUTCOME: District and school personnel increase knowledge and skills in identifying students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: Teachers and other school personnel identify students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
LONG-TERM OUTCOME: Students demonstrate grade level reading skills mastery.

A.3.1 Evaluation Question: To what extent do teachers perceive their knowledge and skills in identifying students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade?
(16) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of teaches perceive their knowledge and skills in identifying students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade has increased.
SHORT-TERM OUTCOME: Teachers increase their knowledge and skills in identifying students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: Teachers identify students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
LONG-TERM OUTCOME: Students demonstrate grade level reading skills mastery.

A.3.2 Evaluation Question: To what extent do teachers perceive their knowledge and skills in identifying and providing appropriate interventions for students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade?
(17) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of teaches perceive their knowledge and skills in identifying and providing appropriate interventions for students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade has increased.
SHORT-TERM OUTCOME: Teachers increase their knowledge and skills in identifying and providing appropriate interventions for students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: Teachers identify and provide appropriate interventions for students at risk for not reading by 3rd grade.
LONG-TERM OUTCOME: Students demonstrate grade level reading skills mastery.

Strategy: Implementation of a High Dosage Tutoring Program
A.4 Evaluation Question: What are overall impacts for implementing High Dosage Tutoring in grades K-3 in reading?
(18) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of students in need of supplemental intervention to address learning loss ae provided High Dosage Tutoring.
SHORT-TERM OUTCOME: Tutors hired to provide High Dosage Tutoring increase their knowledge and skills in providing high dosage tutoring to students at risk for learning loss in grades K-3rd.
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: Tutors provide high dosage tutoring to identified students.
LONG-TERM OUTCOME: Students demonstrate grade level reading skills mastery.

A.4 Evaluation Question: To what extent do student performance improve over time? (Long Term Outcome)
(19) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of students increased their reading performance over time as measured by the STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading.
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: Tutors provide high dosage tutoring to identified students.
LONG-TERM OUTCOME: Students demonstrate grade level reading skills mastery.

Strand (Infrastructure): Collaboration

Strategy: Family Supports/Partnerships with Families
C.2. Evaluation Question: To what extent does collaboration occur at the school level between school and families?
(29) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of families report there is improved collaboration between schools and families
(30) PERFORMANCE INDICATOR: 100% of families report that supports are provided to families to meet the needs of their child.
SHORT-TERM OUTCOME: School personnel and families increase knowledge and skills of effective collaboration.
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: School personnel and families collaborate on delivery of instruction to meet the needs of all students.
LONG-TERM OUTCOME: Students demonstrate grade level reading skills mastery.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

The changes to the SSIP evaluation plan were necessary due to the additional strategies included for this reporting period. The changes are as follows:
1.   Establishing of the Early Warning System for grades Kinder through 3.
2. Implementation of a High Dosage Tutoring program to address learning loss as a result of COVID-19.
3.   The provision of professional development activities to increase school personnel's knowledge and skills in social-emotional learning (SEL).
4. The changing role of the literacy coaches.
5. The increased provision of family supports and partnership with families.

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

For the FFY2020, all infrastructure improvement strategies have been implemented in the scale-up schools (i.e., the remaining six elementary schools).

1. Governance/Leadership
a. Strategy: Universal Screening
The PSS continues to implement the universal screening and the use of the results as secondary data. The outcomes for this strategy were measured by conducting four screenings and fidelity checklist. For SY20-21, the PSS adopted the Renaissance STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading as the source for outcome data at the end of the school year by using Screening #4 data. The implementation of the universal screening has scaled-up to the remaining elementary schools. However, due to COVID-19, the Winter screening for SY21-22 was cancelled as students were placed in remote learning.

b. Strategy: Implementation of Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum
The PSS continues to implement Journeys as its Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum with the core instruction focusing on the foundations of reading. The training was expanded to the scale-up schools.

c. Strategy: Early Warning System for Grades Kinder through 3rd
This is a collaborative project involving multiple PSS early and childhood and K-12 programs, elementary schools, the Regional Education Laboratory (REL) Pacific, and the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS). School teams collect and review data on various elementary student characteristics

and details on their early childhood experiences. The EWS is a tool to track down students' academic performance and other factors such as attendance and movement from one school to another. The tool also flags students who are not reading at grade level. The Response to Intervention (RTI) model is used to address and provide tiered interventions to address students' needs. The EWS indicators are mobility, performance on interim and outcome data (Renaissance STAR Early Literacy/STAR Reading), and attendance. School personnel addressed the immediate needs of students through the progress monitoring of students' attendance and performance. Two of the three SSIP target schools were identified during the SY20-21 as early adopters.

d. Strategy: High-Dosage Tutoring Program was established to mitigate the learning loss of students as a result of COVID-19. The program was implemented in the summer of 2020 and continues during the school year. The program addresses the academic needs of students requiring Tier 2 and 3 academic intervention.

e. Strategy: The establishment of the Family Engagement & Community Involvement Program as a separate unit and the hiring of a Program Manager to implement the program rather than an add-on responsibility to another unit's program manager.

2. Strand: Professional Development
For each of the professional development content areas, training was expanded to the scale-up schools.

a. Strategy: Early Warning Systems (EWS) for K-3
For this reporting period, training was provided to five schools identified as early adopters. Training was provided to these schools.

b.   Strategy: Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)
Social-emotional Learning training was provided to district and school personnel as a behavioral support in collaboration with the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL). The training included training on what Social-emotion learning (SEL), and SEL competencies for school personnel. The SEL training was designed around the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional learning (CASEL) framework (CASEL). It included discussions around communication plans for schools to work on and how to get families engaged in the process. The training promoted increasing school personnel's knowledge of their families and an overall assessment and data collection about the process and the inclusion of families with counselors on all three tiers of intervention.

c. Strategy: Coaching
As reported in the SSIP Phase III Year 5 report, the responsibility of the coaches continues to be under the supervision of the individual schools. Based on the school's needs, some literacy coaches have transition to being an English Language Learner (ELL) coach or Title I teacher. This is at the discretion of the school principal. As a result of direct school-based supports, teachers and other instructional staff were provided on-going and need-based supports. Training focused on the role release and change in focus of the coaching.

d. High-Dosage Tutoring: The outcome for the professional development activities is to increase district and school staff's ability to supplement students' academic needs and address "learning loss" as a result of COVID-19. The PSS provided High-Dosage Tutoring to students during the summer of 2021 and continued during the SY21-22.

3. Strand: Collaborative Efforts
Since the last reporting period, two major efforts have been implemented to promote collaboration to ensure improved outcomes for students with an IEP.
a.   Professional Learning Communities: School and district personnel continued the implementation of Professional Learning Communities to ensure collaboration between general and special educators to improve the outcomes of students with an IEP.
b. Family Supports and Increased Partnership with Parents: There was an increase in partnerships with families as well as family supports in the delivery of instruction through blended learning. Addresses attendance issues when instruction is provided remotely. Refer to specific description under Governance/Leadership strand.
c. Strategy: Student Support Services (SSS) and Office of Curriculum & Instruction (OCI)Leadership Collaborative. —
This strategy involved two units from the Public School System (PSS) collaborating to provide resources for families with an immediate response to meet the needs of the families. The type of support provided included the provision of a tool kit that families can access immediately. This includes access to remote learning through such means as provision of IPAD, MiFi's, Wi-Fi on Wheels, etc.

4. Strand: Accountability System
The CNMI PSS continues with the development and implementation of School Wide Plans (SWPs) to document the inclusion of subgroups in the equitable services and programs. By reviewing the SWPs of each individual school, the district can determine the provision of equitable programs and services to subgroups of students that includes students with an IEP and English Language Learners (ELL).

5. Strand: Monitoring System
Strategy: Conducting observations in the remote and/or in-person instruction to collect data on the implementation of the reading curriculum and instruction in the foundations of reading.
The Office of Curriculum & Instruction continues to monitor the fidelity of implementing the Journeys curriculum and the delivery of instruction in the Foundations of Reading.

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.

1. Governance/Leadership
a. Strategy: Universal Screening
The intermediate outcome includes the participation and proficiency data for all students and disaggregated for students with an IEP in grades K-3rd grade. This reporting period, screening #4 for the SY20-21 was used as the outcome data. Benchmark data for SY21-22 is limited to the Fall'21 screening as the Winter screening was cancelled due to the return to remote learning.
Participation (K-3rd)
          # Of ALL Students/Students with IEP # of ALL Students Screened/Students with IEP * Participation Rate (ALL)/Students w/IEP*
Screening #4 (Outcome for SY20-21). 1040*/116   1031/112   99%/97%
Screening #1 (Fall'21): 1050/82   1031/70   96%/85%

Proficiency Rate Screening #4 (Outcome) Screening #1 (Fall'21) Screening #4 (SPR'21) Screening #1(Fall'21)

Performance Level # of All Students/Students w/IEP % of All Students/Students w/IEP
Screening #4 (Outcome)
At or above Benchmark **513/**13   51%/12%

Screening #1 (Fall'21)
At or above Benchmark **266/5   ***26%/7%

*# of students screened includes K-3rd grade students screened with STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading or alternate screening assessment.
**# of students at or above benchmark includes K-3rd grade students screened with STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading.

The use of universal screening as an infrastructure improvement strategy allows district and school personnel information on students at risk for not meeting the outcomes at the end of the year. The data is used to determine the supplemental supports needed by students to increase the probability of them reading by 3rd grade.

a. Strategy: Implementation of Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum
PSS continues to implement Journeys as its Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum with the core instruction focusing on the foundations of reading. Outcomes for this strategy were measured by classroom observations done in the 3 target schools. The data provides information on the ability of the curriculum to meet the needs of all students in a blended learning environment.

Observations were conducted by the Office of Curriculum & Instruction staff and limited to once a year, 30 minutes each, due to schools being fully remote for 2 of the 3 SSIP target schools.
• Total # of teachers in the three target schools, grades K to 3rd = 46
• Total # of teachers observed: 21
• % Of teachers observed: 46%

Observation focused on two components:
1. Implementation of Core Reading Curriculum – Journeys
Data for the implementation of the Core Reading Curriculum is based on the program's fidelity checklist. Breakdown of the demographics of grades K-3 teachers observed from the 3 target schools are as follows:
Kinder= 3
1st = 4
2nd = 4
3rd = 10
TOTAL= 21

The average percentage of each curriculum component utilized during the observation for the 3 schools is: 50% (average of 3 target schools).

2. Delivery of Core Curriculum Reading Foundations Components
The delivery of the reading foundations components was evaluated by observations. The overall rating was equal to 1*. This corresponds to how much of each component is being utilized during the observation and is not indicative of the evaluation of a teacher's knowledge of the materials.

The observation focused on the following components of the foundations of reading (Results are presented as the average of the 3 target schools):
• Vocabulary (10**) – Average rating =1***
• Comprehension (9) - Average rating = 1.67
• Phonemic Awareness/Phonics (7) = Average rating = 1
• Fluency (3) = Average = 1

**Represents the number of indicators for the specific reading components.
*** Represents the average of the ratings of the teachers for 3 target schools.

The collection of data on the implementation of the core curriculum and the teaching of foundation skills for reading provides the district with the data needed for providing continued professional learning activities at the school and district level.

a. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3
SY20-21 was the first implementation year for the EWS and was limited to 5 schools that are considered as the early adopters. SY21-22 is considered the initial implementation stage. An additional 4 schools were added to the number of schools implementing the EWS.
b.   High Dosage Tutoring
High Dosage Tutoring was initiated during the summer of 2021 to address learning loss and increase students' performance. Students were selected based on their STAR reading data and content level grading and in need of Tier 2 or 3 academic support. 374 students participated from the three SSIP schools; however, the data was not disaggregated to determine the growth of students with an IEP:
• Overall average improvement percentage for the 3 schools participating in the summer enrichment program: 4.33%
•   Average improvement percentage for the 3 schools for students participating in the High Dosage Tutoring program: 4.83%
c. Family Supports and Partnerships with Families
• Establishment of the Family & Community Engagement Program as a separate unit.
• Held a Parent Summit in partnership with the district's Parent Advisory Council for parents from the three CNMI public schools, including Head Start/Early Head Start Centers.

2. Strand: Professional Development
a.   Early Warning Systems for K-3: Short-term outcomes are to increase the knowledge and skills of school personnel in identifying students at risk of not meeting end of year benchmarks. At-risk students are identified at the grade level. Intermediate outcome is to provide interventions to increase the probability of the student achieving end of year benchmark.
b.   Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) training was provided to school personnel as a behavioral support.
c. Coaching
Coaches continue to be under the supervision of the individual schools. Based on the school needs, the principal has the discretion to transition the literacy coach as an English Language Learner (ELL) coach or Title I teacher. Direct school-based supports provided teachers and other instructional

staff on-going and need-based supports.
d. Core Reading Curriculum – Journeys
An afterschool professional activity was provided to all teachers in grades K-5th grade over a span of two days. The outcome was to increase knowledge and skills in implementing the curriculum especially using the online resources in case they must use online platform.

3. Strand: Collaborative Efforts
Two major efforts have been implemented to promote collaboration to ensure improved outcomes for students with an IEP:
a.   Professional Learning Communities: During remote learning, the grade level teams, including special education teachers, met virtually. Discussion included data on students with an IEP and the participants included all stakeholders. For this reporting period, the PLCs met at least seven times.
b.   Family Supports and Increased Partnership with Parents:
•   The outcome is to increase involvement of parents in their child's education. Data collection included the development of a tracker to record attendance at report card conferences, PTSA meetings, and parent activities like Mother Read, Father Read, etc.

4. Strand: Accountability System
The outcome is to ensure that schools address the needs of all students including subgroups such as English Language Learners (ELL) and students with an IEP. The implementation of School Wide Plans (SWPs) by all schools that includes outcomes for subgroups such as students with an IEP ensures that their needs are being met which supports the achievement of the SIMR.

5. Strand: Monitoring System
The outcome ensures the implementation of an evidence-based curriculum with fidelity and sustain improvement efforts in the scale-up schools, using the ELEOT and the Journeys fidelity checklists.

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

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

1. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3
SY20-21 was the first implementation year for the EWS and was limited to five schools that are considered as the early adopters. SY21-22 is considered the initial implementation stage. An additional four schools were added to the number of schools implementing the EWS. The short-term outcomes are to increase the knowledge and skills of school personnel in identifying students at risk of not meeting end of year benchmarks. At-risk students are identified at the class, grade, and school level. Intermediate outcome is to provide interventions to increase the probability of the student achieving end of year benchmark. The identification of any student at risk to include students with an IEP is necessary for the achievement of the SIMR.

2.   High Dosage Tutoring:
The initial implementation of the High Dosage Tutoring was initiated during the summer of 2021 to address the learning loss. Students were selected based on their STAR reading data and content level grading. Each school determined their roster, and the students were identified as in need of Tier 2 or 3 academic support. The outcome is to increase students' performance as a result of the provision in the program.

Student Performance
• Participation of the three SSIP targets: 374 students
• Overall average improvement percentage for the three schools participating in the summer enrichment program: 4.33%
•   Average improvement percentage for the three schools for students participating in the High Dosage Tutoring program: 4.83%

The data indicates that students who participated in the High Dosage Tutoring program showed increased growth as compared to students without a tutor. Though students with an IEP participated in the program, the data was not disaggregated to determine the growth of students with an IEP.

The total number of teachers for the three target schools for Summer'20 = 47

End of Summer Teacher Survey Results (102 Teachers completed the survey)
1. Quality of the program: 44% = Excellent, 35.3% = Very Good, 13.7% = Good
2. Usefulness of the tutor in meeting the student's needs: 57.6% = Excellent, 32.4% = Very Good, 9.8% = Fair

End of Summer Tutor Survey Results (121 Tutors completed the survey)
• 91% of the tutors strongly agreed or agreed that the on-the-job training received was of high quality.
•   95% of the tutors indicated they enjoyed the work.
End of Summer Student Survey (502 students from grades 3rd through 12th completed the survey)
• 88% of the students either strongly agreed or agreed that the tutor helped with activities in the classroom.
• 83% of the students either strongly agreed or agreed that they learned a lot from the tutoring.
•   87% of the students either strongly agreed or agreed that the tutor helped them solve problems or difficult tasks.
•   75% of the students either strongly agreed or agreed that the activities completed were meaningful.

End of Summer Student Survey (502 students from grades K-2nd completed the survey)
• 98% of the students surveyed agreed that the tutor helps with activities in the classroom.
• 89% of the students surveyed agreed that the tutor helped them to solve problems.
• 94% of the students surveyed agreed that the tutor was helpful.

• Conducted High Dosage Tutoring Orientation – 9/22/21

3. Family Supports and Partnerships with Families
• Establishment of the Family Engage & Community Engagement Program as a separate unit.
• The hiring of a Program Manager to implement the program rather than collateral duties for another unit's program manager.
• Held a Parent Summit in partnership with the district's Parent Advisory Council (PAC) for parents from the three Northern Mariana Islands (NMI) public schools include Head Start/Early Head Start Centers.
• Results of Parent Summit Evaluation (Rating: 1 being :Not at all, very inadequate, not useful, or very unlikely to 5 being: Very appropriate, Very adequate, Very useful, or Very likely
o   How appropriate was the content of this parent summit to your role as a parent? Average rating: 4.8

o How useful are the ideas and content of this summit in your role as a parent? Average rating = 4.7
o What impact will the content of this workshop have on your partnership with PSS? Average rating = 4.7
o Did this workshop meet your expectations? Average rating = 4.6
o How do you feel about the overall quality of this workshop? Average rating = 4.6
o How well was the workshop structured? Average rating = 4.7

The outcome for professional development for this strategy is to increase involvement of parents in their child's education. Data collection included the development of a tracker to record attendance at report card conferences and PTSA attendance. Ongoing data is collected on the number of parents participating in such activities as Mother Read, Father Read, etc. The home-school connect discussions focus on academics.

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

I. Governance/Leadership:
a. Universal Screening
Implement the data collection system in the scale-up schools after each screening period and disaggregate by subgroups. Separate data by scale-up schools and target schools. For next reporting period, start with fidelity data collection. The anticipated outcomes include participation and performance data from the three target schools with disaggregated data for students with disabilities. At least 95% of all teachers in target and scale-up schools will implement the universal screening with fidelity.
b. Implementation of evidence-based reading curriculum
• Collect fidelity data from scale-up schools through observations conducted by the school principals.
• Implement intervention supports such as "High Dosage Tutoring" at the school level for students in need of Tier 2 or 3 intervention.
• Collect survey data on foundations of reading from scale-up schools.
• Upgrade the English/Language Arts program to ensure the program incorporates blended learning (i.e., both remote and in-person instruction).
• Provide "Intentional, integrated structure" by examining all the supports to include High Dosage Tutoring, Title I service, coaches for literacy and English Language Learners (ELLs), etc.
• Examine priority standards for implementation that is leveraging, readiness, endurance, and exit from system.
One of the anticipated outcomes is to implement a reading curriculum that addresses the two modes of learning: remote and in-person learning. The other outcomes include the majority of teachers implementing the reading curriculum with fidelity and the students in need of additional supports will be provided the high dosage tutoring.
c. Early Warning System (EWS):
Continue with technical assistance from REL Pacific. Expand participation to four additional schools. Set up and provide interventions for students that have been identified as in need of supplemental supports. Implement the "Infinite Campus" (Student Information System) to include EWS as part of the system to delete the need for manual entries which will improve reporting.

d. High-Dosage Tutoring (HDT)
Set up infrastructure that will sustain the High Dosage Tutoring beyond the COVID-19 funds and ensure systemic change. Continue working with REL Pacific on the need to prioritize on how we need to prioritize HDT with professional development. Incorporate social-emotional learning in the HDT supports, progress monitoring, and the use of evidence-based intervention practices that includes improving literacy.
SY21-22
The outcome for SY21-22 for the tutoring program is to mitigate the students' learning by increasing the number of students who pass their classes and increase the percentage of students who achieve proficiency scores in STAR Reading and STAR Math by at least 3%.
Total number of tutors for the three target schools = 15
• To provide intensive tutoring for students at least 3 times a week.
• To help students accelerate their learning in an individualized manner
• To recruit and hire highly effective tutors
• To use tutoring as additional support to help students build prerequisite skills and knowledge while simultaneously integrating new learning.
• Conduct teacher, student, and tutor evaluations.
2. Professional Development
a. Delivery of PD
• Continued school level trainings that focus on foundations of reading, pedagogy, and universal screenings at the scale-up schools.
• Map out 3-year plan based on survey results and based on grade band-K-2 and 2-5
• Incorporate Early learning (PreK-3) and Head Start programs in the professional development activities with a focus on transitions, learning environment, data use of improvement, data-driven, family and community engagement, and teacher effectiveness.
• Provide training for teachers in assisting and using the tutors under the HDT support program. Assist teachers in determining how best to utilize services and how intervention practices are aligned with instruction.
• Provide professional learning activities with a focus on relationship building, dynamics of relationship, and making connections w/students.

b. Coaching
• Hire teachers for all ELL students.
• Implement the coaching system based on the needs of the individual elementary school and ensure that each school has at least one literacy and one English language learner (ELL) coach.
• Align coaching activities with strategic performance management.
• Collect data on the impact of the provision of literacy and ELL coaches in both the target and scale-up schools.
The anticipated outcome is that all elementary schools has at least one literacy and one ELL coach that supports teachers and improves literacy achievement for students in grades K-3rd.

3. Collaborative Efforts
Implementation of Professional Learning Communities
• Continue grade level collaboration through professional learning communities.
• Collect fidelity and outcome data for PLCs to include scale-up schools.
• Collect data from collaborative teams and have them rate themselves on the quality of the collaborative time and participation of critical members.
Anticipated outcome is that all teachers will work collaboratively to ensure evidence-based literacy instruction is provided to improve literacy skills for all students.

Family Supports/Partnerships with Families
• Increase literacy activities for families and gradually provide more opportunities to engage them.
• Expand and promote literacy piece at the annual parent summit to improve engagement in child's learning. Feature programs that parents

can use at home.
• Provide families with training on accessing online libraries, Lexia, etc. and demonstrate to parents how the features of each program and how to support their child with its use.
Anticipated outcome is that parents' knowledge and skills in literacy will increase, and they will be better equipped to support instruction at home.

4. Accountability Systems
School Wide Plans (SWPs)
• Ensure that all schools develop and implement a SWP that measures outcomes on student achievement and disaggregates data by subgroups.
• Implement new format for School Wide Plans (SWPs) with the use of accreditation system in both target and scale-up schools. This involves the use of the Cognia e-Prove template.
Anticipated outcome is that all schools monitor the progress of student achievement throughout the year and adjust SWP as appropriate to meet the needs of the students.

5. Monitoring System
Monitoring Process
Implement reading curriculum fidelity observations in scale-up schools – Refer to Governance/Leadership above for specific next steps and outcomes.

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

1.   Universal Screening:
2. Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum - Journeys
3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3
4. High-dosage Tutoring
5. School-based training in the Foundations of Reading
6. Coaching
7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
8.   Data-based decision making
9. Classroom observations -monitoring the fidelity in implementation of evidence-based instructional programs
JUST TRYING TO SURVIVE!

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

1. The universal screening is conducted four times during the school year. The Fall, Winter, and Spring are considered benchmark data with the final (4th screening) considered as outcome or end of year summative data.
2. Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum – Journeys: Implemented in all elementary schools – reading instruction provided for 90 minutes.
3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3: The attendance and performance of all K-3 students are monitored on an on-going basis.
4. High Dosage Tutoring: High-Dosage Tutoring was initiated in the Summer of '20 to address the learning loss of students. Tutoring was provided daily for 40-60 minutes in groups of a maximum of three students.
5. Professional development activities related to the Foundations of Reading
6. Coaching – the provision of coaching in literacy and to address instruction for English Language Learners (ELLs). Each elementary school is provided at least one of each type of coach.
7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) – Each grade level meets as a PLC team to address data and needs of every student to include needs of subgroups such as students with an IEP and ELLs.
8. School Wide Plans (SWPs) Data-based decision making: Each school is required to submit a School Wide Plan (SWP) each year that addresses the needs of the students in the school. The SWP must include activities and outcomes for subgroups such as students with an IEP and ELLs.
Monitoring the fidelity of reading curriculum and delivery of evidence-based instruction: Classroom observations with a duration of at least 30 minutes are conducted at least annually.

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.

1.   Universal Screening: The Fall, Winter, and Spring screening benchmarks identifies students at risk for not meeting end of year outcomes and provides data that assist school personnel in providing supplemental interventions to meet the students' needs. This practice is implemented in all elementary schools.
2. Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum: The implementation of an evidence-based early literacy and reading curriculum increases the probability of achieving the SIMR.
3. Early Warning System (EWS): The implementation of the EWS for grades K-3 is the overarching strategy that ensures that needs of students are identified early enough to provide interventions. This is in line with implementing universal screening.
4.   High Dosage Tutoring: The supplemental instruction provided by the provision of High Dosage Tutoring closes the gap between where the students are performing and where they should be.
5.   Professional Development that is ongoing and job-embedded in the areas related to literacy and the use of data will improve delivery of literacy instruction and improve student outcomes.
6.   The addition of coaching to improve the instruction will improve the delivery of literacy instruction that will improve student learning.
7.   Professional Learning Communities allows horizontal alignment of instruction and opportunity for modeling effective practices that will increase student outcomes.
8. School Wide Plans (SWPs) that include outcomes for disaggregated groups will ensure that schools are held accountable for all students and promotes data-based decision making.
Monitoring the implementation of the reading curriculum with a focus on the foundations of reading through fidelity checks will provide data that will be used to support the need for additional supports and training.

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

1. Governance/Leadership
a. Universal Screening
Screenings are conducted four times a year. Fidelity checks are conducted during each screening period.

b.   Implementation of Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum

There are two forms of data collected by the Office of Curriculum & Instruction. Fidelity data is collected on the Journeys curriculum. In addition, data is collected on the delivery of core instruction in the foundations of reading. Data is collected at least once a year.

c. Early Warning System (EWS)
The impact of the implementation of the EWS will be measured by the number of students identified as needing supplemental supports and the effectiveness of the interventions to improve instruction.

d. High Dosage Tutoring
Program evaluation surveys are conducted at the end of each year and the results used to address areas for strength and areas for growth. Surveys are collected from tutors, teachers, and students.

2. Professional Development
All professional development activities are initially evaluated with a "Reaction Survey" at the end of each activity and observations to collect data on change in practices.

3. Collaborative Efforts
Professional Learning Community
Data on participation and data discussion of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are collected monthly.

Family Supports/Family Partnerships
Data will be collected on participation of families in activities to improve student achievement as well as reaction surveys.

4. Accountability System
School Wide Plans (SWPs) are reviewed annually and if approved, activities are funded for implementation. SWPs are evaluated to determine if the plan addresses the academic needs of subgroups such as students with an IEP. With this requirement, the schools are held accountable for all students.

5. Monitoring System
The Office of Curriculum & Instruction continues to monitor the fidelity of implementing the Journeys curriculum and the delivery of the Foundations of Reading as described in the section on Governance/Leadership.

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.
Refer to data provided in Section A and B.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.
1.   Universal Screening:
• Collect fidelity data from the scale-up schools with the anticipated outcome that teachers are implementing the screening tool appropriately.

2. Evidence-based Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum:
•   Review the current curriculum and determine its effectiveness for blended learning (virtual and in-person learning) with the outcome is the selection of a new curriculum or additional resources to support the current curriculum in a blended learning teaching environment.

3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3
Increase the number of schools participating in the EWS system with the outcome to timely identification of students and delivery of needed supplemental interventions.

4. High Dosage Tutoring
Increase the capacity of each elementary school to provide High Dosage Tutoring to students in need of it with the outcome of improved achievement.

5. School-based training in the Foundations of Reading
Expand the training in the foundations of reading to the scale-up schools and collect fidelity checks with the outcome of improved student reading skills.

6. Coaching
Provide each school with at least one literacy and one ELL coach with the outcome of improved delivery of instruction.

7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
Collect PLC data on participation of general education and special education in PLC sessions with discussions that includes performance of students with an IEP. Outcome is improved achievement for all students, but specifically for students with an IEP.

8.   Data-based decision making
Monitor the submission of SWPs from the scale-up schools. Outcome is to ensure that program services and activities address the needs of subgroups such as students with an IEP.

9. Classroom observations -monitoring the fidelity in implementation of evidence-based instructional programs
Collect fidelity data on the implementation of the reading curriculum in the scale-up schools with the outcome that teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2020 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad

stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data, national data to determine targets. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was presented to the Instructional Service and Assessment (ISA) subcommittee, the Fiscal, Personnel, and Administration subcommittee, provided to the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Education for endorsement.

This FFY 2020 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2020 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2020 targets, an explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. SPP Indicators 3, 5, and 6 include new measurements that require reestablishing baseline in FFY 2020. A response to any issue identified in the 2021 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2019 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

• Input was obtained from members of the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP) quarterly meeting.
•   Focus group sessions were conducted at the school sites with guided questions.
• Input from SSIP Core Team members composed of school leaders, district representatives from the Office of Curriculum & Instruction (OCI), Office of Assessment, Research, and Evaluation (ARE), Special Education, and technical assistance providers from UOG CEDDERS.
•   Input obtained through the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) work session and meetings.

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

The most effective strategy utilized to engage stakeholders was maintaining ongoing communication with them. This involved various formats that included virtual meetings, newsletters, and in-person meetings as appropriate while complying with COVID-19 safety procedures.

Strategies to Engage District & School Personnel
• Other strategies include conducting data dialogues at the district and school level and sharing of documents. The data dialogues include discussions on the reading and math data and how teachers are monitoring progress towards proficiency. Upon completion of screening period, the data dialogues include review of the benchmark categories and the percentage of students falling in which category and using the data to drive the interventions to be provided.
•   As part of its Early Warning System (EWS), school personnel have utilized curriculum-based measurements (CBM) to progress monitor. The EWS tool has been useful for the teachers as well as the families. The stakeholders can determine the present levels of students. As a result of the use of the EWS tool, teachers and students can discuss their goals and expected performance levels. The teachers' conversation with their students supports the students in understanding their academic screening and outcome reports.

Strategies to Engage Families
• Maintaining a program manager to implement the Interim Family and Community Engagement program.
• Membership and attendance at the Parent Advisory Council (PAC) work sessions and meetings.
• Periodic social media posts regarding PSS's Learning Modes, safe reopening of schools, school schedules/calendar, program outreach supports (Mental Health, Social Emotional Learning, Counseling, etc.), etc.
•   The distribution of monthly Students First Newsletters (District newsletter).
•   The implementation of monthly interviews with local radio broadcasting companies to update families on the status of the learning platforms.
• The adoption and implementation of the Epstein Parental Involvement framework.
•   Another strategy to engage families is the sharing of benchmark scores with user-friendly language such as in forums such as Child Study Team (CST meetings), Parent-Teacher conferences, IEP meetings, etc. The discussion includes what it means for the child and what is expected for grade level. With this information, families can develop a goal for improvement. The engagement of parents in literacy programs such as "Literacy Nights & Day" engages them in the key improvement efforts by increasing their knowledge and skills in supporting their child's literacy skills.
•   Conducting a Parent Summit held on October 9, 2021, to update parents as well as gather input on the state of their child's education and impact because of COVID-19.
• Dissemination of surveys that included issues related to COVID-19 safety measures, school reopening, and school reopening face-to-face. Results were shared at the PAC, PTSA, Board meetings and virtually through Zoom and Facebook Live.
•   The provision of mini lessons conducted virtually with parents, parent professional learning at the school level, and mental health and wellness parent outreach activities.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

To ensure that concerns do not result in long-term or unresolved concerns, individual schools as well as school personnel upon receipt of a concern follow-up with inquiries and address them immediately.

Concerns from School Personnel
1. COVID-19 Related Concerns
COVID-19 related concerns that included logical problems, and availability and provision of personal protective equipment (PPE), and the requirement of social distancing that restricts group work and class setup. Individual schools have taken it upon themselves to resolve these issues at the school level. To address the concerns, individual school have ensured the availability and provision of PPEs. To address the classroom environment, additional student furniture was secured for the intermediate students at the elementary level. Efforts were made at the school to maximize the available space within the school while at the same time complying with social distancing requirements.

2. Increased absenteeism
There has been an increase in absenteeism both with in-person instruction as well as during remote learning despite the access to and provision of necessary devices. To address this concern, school personnel have resorted to strategies such as constant reminders, documentation, home visits, attendance notices, parent conferences with an administrator or counselor, and the provision of afterschool and Saturday programs to help students catch up.

3. Reporting of STAR data
Teachers are concerned about the change in reporting the performance of students on the screenings and outcome assessment using Renaissance STAR Early Literacy/Reading. The change involved going from projected scaled scores to the number of students project to meet proficiency. This is aligned with the district's reports. To address this concern, the rationale for the changes and its implications for the teacher are discussed with the goal of alignment and improvement.

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.

NA

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

NA

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

The newly identified barrier to improvement in reading proficiency was the transition from full in-person instruction to blended learning which is a combination of virtual and in-person learning because of the COVID-19 pandemic. To address this barrier, the offices of Student Support Services (SSS) and Curriculum and Instruction (OCI) collaborated by providing families with a tool kit that was available immediately to access remote learning through such means as provision of an IPAD, MiFi's, and WiFi on Wheels.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

CNMI has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

CNMI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

CNMI did not provide the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data table. CNMI must provide the description of the numerator and denominator used to calculate its FFY 2020 data.

CNMI did not provide any data, aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR), for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether CNMI met its target.

CNMI provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps CNMI has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Chief State School Officer

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:

Alfred Ada, Ed.D.

Title:

Commissioner of Education

Email:

pss.coe@cnmipss.org

Phone:

6702373061

Submitted on: