State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report: Part B

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

For reporting on
FFY18

Northern Mariana Islands

PART B DUE February 3, 2020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of CNMI's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2018. 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 FFY 2018 APR.

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel, SESAP, provided input on additional targets of Results Indicators for FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 3A, 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR.

Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

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.

General Supervision
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.

TA Systems
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 schools aligned to the school needs. Over 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. PSS also contracts with the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (Guam CEDDERS) for targeted and onsite 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 students with disabilities.

The CNMI PSS has in place a system of professional development (PD) to ensure that service providers, teachers and school level personnel have the knowledge and skills needed to improve the results of all students including students with disabilities. All PSS school level staff are required to maintain 60 PD hours per contract year and to participate in 10 PD events during the school year. Two (2) of the 10 days are designated PD specific to PSS wide initiatives and 8 days are specific to school level needs.

In school year 2018-2019, 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 selected a new Language Arts curriculum for KG to 6th grades. PD has been provided 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.
• A universal screening has been implemented in all KG to 3rd grade. All teachers, Literacy Coaches and Title I teachers were provided PD on the implementation of the screening procedures with fidelity to ensure the screening data are valid and reliable. The training included data collection and use to make instructional based decisions.

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. The special education teachers of the target schools have been provided with ongoing professional development on the development of present levels of performance, goal development, and progress monitoring.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

Stakeholder Involvement
With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the CNMI PSS, Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input in the review and development of the CNMI Part B FFY 2018 Annual Performance Report (APR). Primary stakeholders (Special Education State Advisory Panel and school administrators) reviewed current performance data to determine progress on the targets, OSEP's Part B Determination Letter issued on June 20, 2019, the RDA Matrix, and the HTDMD document, which shows how OSEP made the CNMI determination using compliance and results data related to: (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments; (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out. OSEP identifies a State or Entity as needs intervention under IDEA Part B if its RDA Percentage is less than 60%. The CNMI's RDA Percentage was 53%, needs Intervention.

In FFY 2013, the CNMI primary stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators for FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.

For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)
NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

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.cnmipssoare.org/records-data-management.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 17, the CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted no later than April 1, 2020. CNMI's SSIP Phase III Year 4 will include CNMI's FFY 2018 progress data for its SiMR and progress data and information on CNMI's SSIP implementation.

Specific Conditions imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI for FFY 2018:
1. Technical assistance received: CNMI continues to work with the Department's Risk Management Service (RMS) to address CNMI's Public School System (PSS) 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
o Increased communication and dialogue with Federal Fiscal Office;
o Improved information sharing regarding CNMI's longstanding non-compliance Special Conditions;
o Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years;
o Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Specific Conditions
o Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years; and
o Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Special Conditions

Intro - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided a Web link to the publicly reported on the [FFY 2017 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) performance plan required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, but the performance plan cannot be easily accessed using that Web link.

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and OSEP accepts that target.

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) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2017	76.39%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%	
Data	72.58%	82.00%	80.00%	82.00%	76.39%

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input in the review of the graduation reporting requirements for the FFY 2018 Annual Performance Report (APR). Stakeholders included secondary teachers, school administrators, parents and the Special Education State Advisory Panel. The Stakeholders reviewed current performance data to determine progress on the graduation target for FFY 2018. It should be noted that effective FFY 2017, OSEP required CNMI to calculate its graduation rate using one of two options when reporting graduation data: adjusted cohort rate or 618 data. In order to ensure the CNMI is providing accurate and consistent graduation rates for students with IEP's, the CNMI was to use a four year adjusted cohort rate required under the ESEA OR the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (file specification FS009). With stakeholder input, CNMI agreed the 618 data reported to the Department is most accurate and consistent to report graduation rate. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel, SESAP, provided input on the additional target for FFY 2019 for Indicator 1.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	62
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	69
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	89.86%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
62	69	76.39%	80.00%	89.86%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

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

Other

If extended, provide the number of years

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

Graduation Conditions
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

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Effective FFY 2017, OSEP required CNMI to change its method for calculating graduation rates for Indicator 1. The FFY 2017 performance data therefore represents CNMI's baseline data for Indicator 1, which was accepted by OSEP.

In FFY 2017, to ensure the CNMI is providing accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEPs, stakeholders reviewed the graduation and exit data, OSEP's options for calculating and reporting graduation data and compared the data to existing calculations. With stakeholder input, the CNMI agreed to use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009) as its method for calculating graduation rates for Indicator 1. Therefore, the CNMI reports a graduation percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator. For example, for 2017-2018, the percentage is calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the exit reason category graduated with a regular high school diploma by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died), then multiplying the result by 100.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

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

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2008	9.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target <=	4.00%	4.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%
Data	2.47%	4.45%	7.46%	8.78%	5.07%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Stakeholder Input
The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, continue to facilitate input sessions with various stakeholders such as secondary teachers, principals, Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP) members, to discuss current dropout rate of students with disabilities in the CNMI and Nation wide. The stakeholders discuss current performance, trend data, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes needed, prevention program and strategies, and implementation of effective pilot programs. In the past year, the Board of Education and PSS leadership engaged in several systemic initiatives at the school level, program level and community level to address dropout prevention strategies that can impact the dropout rate of students with and without disabilities.

Systemic Initiatives:
• School Attendance Review Committee (SARC)
The School Attendance Review Committee (SARC) continues to address attendance issues and concerns at the school level and what the school system is doing to decrease or prevent students from dropping out. The committee members include school counselors and other PSS departments, representatives from the Child Protective Unit, Juvenile Protection Unit, Division of Youth Services, Public Safety, and the Coalition of Private Schools.

The SARC Committee meet several times per month with school counselors and other SARC members to plan a course of action per student. The actions include home visits with Child Protective Unit, special education administration and other school personnel and have resulted in harsher penalties levied against the parent. This process has been successful for several students thus far as they have returned to school and their attendance has been closely monitored.

• Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP)
The SESAP members continue to review and discuss the APR drop out data and provide input for indicators that report slippage. Indicator 2, the Dropout Rate, has remained an interest to the members. The SESAP focus group conducts work sessions to look at the data to determine contributing factors to students dropping out. The focus group also reviews current graduation policies and implications for possible policy revisions to the graduation requirement.

• Secondary Teacher Focus Group
The secondary special education teachers continue to address issues and concerns specific to students in middle and high school. As a result of their discussions, the group implemented a high school advocacy course entitled "Self Advocacy 101" in all of the high schools. The course focuses on self-determination, development of soft skills, real job opportunities, and dropout prevention strategies. Over the next few years, PSS will review and analyze it's data to determine the impact of the course on dropout prevention.

• The Office of Curriculum and Instruction and Office of Student Support Services
Because dropout prevention is a high priority for the PSS, the Offices of Student Support Services and Curriculum and Instruction worked collaboratively with high school principals and the Northern Marianas Trades Institute to develop alternate paths to graduate from high school into promising careers if college is not in the student's immediate future plan, including the creation of the Da'ok Academy which is high school setting designed for students at risk of dropping out, including students with disabilities. Students with disabilities who are on alternative paths to graduation will attain the required number of credits needed to graduate with a diploma however, the course work is a career path in culinary arts, mechanics, and engineering. Da'ok Academy has partnered with the Northern Marianas Trades Institute and a formal MOU was signed in SY 2018-2019.

• Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of Education and the Northern Marianas Trades Institute (NMTI) and Da'Ok Academy
The Board of Education and the Northern Marianas Trades Institute, signed a MOU in September 2017 to offer selected career and technical education programs for High School juniors and seniors, as well as freshmen and sophomore who are seventeen years of age or older who attend PSS high schools. The MOU allows for students to take NMTI courses at approved sites and for high school students to receive credits towards graduation and provides students with applicable skills for job placement upon graduation and to receive NMTI - and industry-recognized certification. DaOk Academy students are now dual enrolled in the PSS high school as well as the NMTI and will graduate with high school diplomas and NMTI certification.

In 2019, the SESAP provided input on the additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator
Option 2
Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	62
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	0
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	7
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

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

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

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)
NO

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

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs in grades 9 to 12	**FFY 2017 Data**	**FFY 2018 Target**	**FFY 2018 Data**	**Status**	**Slippage**
7	323	5.07%	2.00%	2.17%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable
XXX

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

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 below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	92.00%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%
A	Overall	78.00%	Actual	92.44%	92.02%	91.89%	90.95%	91.46%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	92.00%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%
A	Overall	85.00%	Actual	92.44%	92.23%	92.76%	84.99%	92.08%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019.   The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

Data Source:

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

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	84	76	77	66	59	60					62

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	2	1	0	0	0					4
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	74	64	69	60	48	45					48
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6	6	4	5	8	10					6

Data Source:

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

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	84	76	77	66	59	60					62
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	2	1	0	0	0					4
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	74	64	69	60	48	47					49
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6	6	4	5	8	10					6

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	484	460	91.46%	95.00%	95.04%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	484	463	92.08%	95.00%	95.66%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

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.

The CNMI Assessment Results can be found on the following url link: https://www.cnmipssoare.org/student-assessments/act-aspire-targets-annual-growth-reports

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments at the State level. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

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

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	20.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
A	Overall	11.00%	Actual	21.59%	4.00%	5.01%	6.07%	7.52%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	20.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%
A	Overall	10.00%	Actual	23.41%	7.98%	6.86%	8.83%	9.73%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					

H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	60.00%	60.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	60.00%	60.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019.   The remaining two Indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

YES

Data Source:

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

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	80	72	74	65	56	55					58
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	1	0	1	1	3					0
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0	2	1	2					1

Data Source:

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

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	80	72	74	65	56	57					59
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0					0
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	2	0	0	0	0					0
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	3	1	3	3	3					3

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	460	15	7.52%	60.00%	3.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	The CNMI did not meet its 3C Reading or Math targets and demonstrated slippage by 4.26% in Reading and 4.98% in Math as measured by the state assessment, Act Aspire, and alternate assessment, the Multi-State Alternate Assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities. These results are similar to the overall assessment results for all students. These results are similar to the overall assessment results for all students. The Office of Accountability, Research and Evaluation and the Office of Curriculum and Instruction have been tasked to review the root cause of the low performance of all students on the state assessment. The review will include looking at the alignment of the curriculum, instruction and assessment framework. In SY 2013-14, the CNMI was required to develop a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), to determine a State Identified Measurable Result (SMIR) and to develop coherent improvement strategies to address and improve the SMIR. During the data drill down Phase of the SSIP, it was noted that PSS did not have a systemic or systematic universal screening process for reading or math or a systemic reading or math curriculum implemented in any school or any grade level. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction was then tasked to select a universal screener and an early literacy and reading curriculum for the primary grades, math curriculum for the upper grades. This activity was completed in SY 2018-19. The follow up activity is to conduct an Instructional Review Process (IRP) to determine if the reading and math curricula are implemented with fidelity. The first round of the fidelity observations conducted for reading indicated that the curriculum is not being implemented with fidelity. Training has been and continues to be provided to teachers on the foundations of reading and math instruction.
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	463	22	9.73%	60.00%	4.75%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	The CNMI did not meet its 3C Reading or Math targets and demonstrated slippage by 4.26% in Reading and 4.98% in Math as measured by the state assessment, Act Aspire, and alternate assessment, the Multi-State Alternate Assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities. These results are similar to the overall assessment results for all students. The Office of Accountability, Research and Evaluation and the Office of Curriculum and Instruction have been tasked to review the root cause of the low performance of all students on the state assessment. The review will include looking at the alignment of the curriculum, instruction and assessment framework. In SY 2013-14, the CNMI was required to develop a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), to determine a State Identified Measurable Result (SMIR) and to develop coherent improvement strategies to address and improve the SMIR. During the data drill down Phase of the SSIP, it was noted that PSS did not have a systemic or systematic universal screening process for reading or math or a systemic reading or math curriculum implemented in any school or any grade level. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction was then tasked to select a universal screener and an early literacy and reading curriculum for the primary grades, math curriculum for the upper grades. This activity was completed in SY 2018-19. The follow up activity is to conduct an Instructional Review Process (IRP) to determine if the reading and math curricula are implemented with fidelity. The first round of the fidelity observations conducted for reading indicated that the curriculum is not being implemented with fidelity. Training has been and continues to be provided to teachers on the foundations of reading and math instruction.
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

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.

The CNMI Assessment Results can be found on the following url link: https://www.cnmipssoare.org/student-assessments/act-aspire-targets-annual-growth-reports

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments at the state level. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2008	2.40%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

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

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

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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)

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

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.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

As per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 4B is not applicable to the CNMI.

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NA

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

NA

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

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

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

NA

NA

If YES, select one of the following:

NA

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

NA

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.

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%
A	68.00%	Data	91.09%	89.85%	84.87%	82.16%	83.69%
B	2005	Target <=	5.00%	4.80%	4.60%	4.40%	4.20%
B	10.00%	Data	1.83%	2.10%	2.14%	2.04%	2.74%
C	2005	Target <=	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%
C	1.00%	Data	0.24%	0.12%	0.00%	0.12%	0.60%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	85.00%	85.00%
Target B <=	4.00%	3.00%
Target C <=	0.70%	0.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	856

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	724
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	5

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
Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	724	856	83.69%	85.00%	84.58%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	18	856	2.74%	4.00%	2.10%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	5	856	0.60%	0.70%	0.58%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements *[c1+c2+c3]*							

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)
NO

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

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

    A.   Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

    B.   Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%
A	85.00%	Data	79.31%	88.10%	83.87%	85.87%	87.07%
B	2011	Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	0.00%	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	86.00%	86.00%
Target B <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019.   The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	108

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	85
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	85	108	87.07%	86.00%	78.70%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	108	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	IEP placement decisions are made by the IEP team including the parent and are based on the unique needs of the student. The data was verified and was determined to be accurate and valid. Of the 108 students with disabilities 3 to 5 years old served, 23 or 21.30% were provided special education and related service in their home, as per their IEPs, which represents an increase from 15 children in FFY 2017 to 23 children in FFY 2018. For preschoolers, the CNMI considers home as the child's natural environment.
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	90.00%	91.50%	92.50%	93.50%	95.00%
A1	96.00%	Data	90.48%	72.73%	83.33%	75.00%	100.00%
A2	2008	Target >=	47.00%	49.00%	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%
A2	37.00%	Data	54.84%	61.54%	68.75%	68.09%	39.02%
B1	2008	Target >=	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%
B1	100.00%	Data	100.00%	84.85%	90.63%	62.50%	97.44%
B2	2008	Target >=	29.00%	29.00%	30.00%	30.00%	31.00%
B2	22.00%	Data	29.03%	33.33%	46.88%	31.91%	19.51%
C1	2008	Target >=	86.50%	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%
C1	96.20%	Data	86.96%	74.07%	95.24%	59.26%	100.00%
C2	2008	Target >=	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%	71.50%	72.00%
C2	44.40%	Data	70.97%	51.28%	68.75%	59.57%	41.46%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	96.50%	96.50%
Target A2 >=	57.00%	57.00%
Target B1 >=	100.00%	100.00%
Target B2 >=	31.00%	31.00%
Target C1 >=	96.50%	96.50%
Target C2 >=	72.50%	72.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019.   The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

46

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4	8.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	24	52.17%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	21.74%

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	17.39%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who 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)*	34	38	100.00%	96.50%	89.47%	Did Not Meet Target	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)*	18	46	39.02%	57.00%	39.13%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4	8.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	36	78.26%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	13.04%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	42	46	97.44%	100.00%	91.30%	Did Not Meet Target	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	46	19.51%	31.00%	13.04%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4	8.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	25	54.35%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	10	21.74%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7	15.22%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	35	39	100.00%	96.50%	89.74%	Did Not Meet Target	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.	17	46	41.46%	72.50%	36.96%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	CNMI's performance for FFY 2018 7A SS1 was 89.47% (34/38) of preschoolers who entered the program below age expectations in the area of positive social-emotional skills and substantially increased in their rate of growth in the area of positive social-emotional skills by the time they exited the program. This represents slippage of 10.53% from CNMI's FFY 2017 performance of 100% (34/34). The national data for FFY 2017 7A SS1 was reported at 81%. Stakeholders indicated that although there was slippage for this reporting period, CNMI performed at a higher percentage than the national data of 81%. Acknowledging it might be difficult to maintain a performance of 100%, CNMI reviewed the following data points to identify possible reasons for slippage: Age of entry, length of service, disability, setting, and whether early intervention was received. In drilling down the data, CNMI considered the difficulty in making program implications when reviewing data with a small "n" size of four exiting preschoolers under category "b." CNMI therefore reviewed factors that possibly contributed to those preschoolers who exited the program under "c, d, and e" categories as the basis for determining possible reasons for slippage in 7A SS1. These categories included a total of 42 preschoolers (24 under c, 10 under d and 8 under e). The review considered factors that possibly contributed to the preschoolers improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations by the time they exited the program. The two data points used as factors for reasons for slippage were length of service and setting. The length of service data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations for positive social-emotional skills (categories c, d, and e) revealed that the majority or 52.38% (22/42) received more than 24 months of service. By categories, the data showed that, as a group, the percentages increased in order of the categories: "c"= 45.83% (11/24), "d"= 50.00% (5/10), and "e"= 75.00% (6/8). The setting data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations for positive social-emotional skills (categories c, d, and e) showed that the majority or 85.71% (36/42) of the exiting preschoolers were in Head Start or Private School. These settings are considered typical preschool classroom settings where other preschoolers without disabilities attend. It should be noted that all three categories reported at least 80% of the preschoolers attending Head Start or Private School: "c"= 87.50% (21/24); "d"= 80.00% (8/10); "e"= 87.50% (7/8). After reviewing the data for length of service and setting, stakeholders, including preschool program providers, discussed that how long services were provided and where preschoolers received services could be reasons for slippage in 7A SS1. As discussed earlier, the majority of exiting preschoolers under categories "c, d, and e" received services for more than 24 months and were in typical preschool classroom settings.
A2	XXX
B1	CNMI's performance for FFY 2018 7B SS1 was 91.30% (42/46) of children who entered the program below age expectations in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills and substantially increased in their rate of growth in this area by the time they exited the program. This represented slippage by 6.14% from CNMI's FFY 2017 performance of 97.44% (38/39). The national data for FFY 2017 7B SS1 was reported at 81%. Stakeholders indicated that although there was slippage for this reporting period, CNMI performed at a higher percentage than the national data of 81%.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	CNMI reviewed the following data points to identify possible reasons for slippage: Age of entry, length of service, disability, setting, and whether early intervention was received. In drilling down the data, CNMI considered the difficulty in making program implications when reviewing data with small "n" sizes of four exiting preschoolers under category "b" and six exiting preschoolers under category "d." CNMI therefore reviewed factors that possibly contributed to those preschoolers who exited the program under "c" category as the basis for determining possible reasons for slippage in 7B SS1, which included 36 preschoolers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. Category "c" is one of the data elements used for determining performance for 7B SS1. Consistent with 7A SS1, the two data points used as factors for reasons for slippage were length of service and setting. The length of service data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers under category "c" revealed that the majority or 58.33% (21/36) received more than 24 months of service. The setting data showed that the majority or 88.89% (32/36) of the preschoolers were in Head Start or Private School. These settings are considered typical preschool classroom settings where other preschoolers without disabilities attend. After reviewing the data for length of service and setting, stakeholders, including preschool program providers, discussed that how long services were provided and where preschoolers received services could be reasons for slippage in 7B SS1. As discussed earlier, the majority of exiting preschoolers under category "c" received services for more than 24 months and were in typical preschool classroom settings.
B2	CNMI's performance for FFY 2018 7B SS2 was 13.04% (6/46) of children who were functioning within age expectation in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills by the time they exited the program. This represents slippage by 6.47% from CNMI's FFY 2017 performance of 19.51% (8/41). By numbers, this slippage represented a decrease of two exiting preschoolers accounted for under 7B SS2 and an increase in the total number of exiting preschoolers from 41 in FFY 2017 to 46 in FFY 2018. CNMI reviewed the following data points to identify possible reasons for slippage: Age of entry, length of service, disability, setting, and whether early intervention was received. In drilling down the data, CNMI considered the difficulty in making program implications when reviewing data with small "n" sizes of four exiting preschoolers under category "b" and six exiting preschoolers under category "d." CNMI therefore reviewed factors that possibly contributed to those preschoolers who exited the program under "c" category as the basis for determining possible reasons for slippage in 7B SS2, which included 36 preschoolers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. Consistent with 7B SS1, the two data points used as factors for reasons for slippage were length of service and setting. The length of service data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers under category "c" revealed that the majority or 58.33% (21/36) received more than 24 months of service. The setting data showed that the majority or 88.89% (32/36) of the preschoolers were in Head Start or Private School. These settings are considered typical preschool classroom settings where other preschoolers without disabilities attend. After reviewing the data for length of service and setting, stakeholders, including preschool program providers, discussed that how long services were provided could be a reason for slippage in 7B SS2. As discussed earlier, the majority of exiting preschoolers under category "c" received services for more than 24 months, but this majority represented 21 of the 36 preschoolers, which means 15 of the 36 preschoolers received less than 24 months of service.
C1	CNMI's performance for FFY 2018 7C SS1 was 89.74% (35/39) of children who entered the program below age expectations in the area of use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs and substantially increased in their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. This represents slippage by 10.26% from CNMI's FFY 2017 performance of 100% (33/33). The national data for FFY 2017 7C SS1 was reported at 81%. Stakeholders indicated that although there was slippage for this reporting period, CNMI performed at a higher percentage than the national data of 81%. CNMI reviewed the following data points to identify possible reasons for slippage: Age of entry, length of service, disability, setting, and whether early intervention was received. In drilling down the data, CNMI considered the difficulty in making program implications when reviewing data with a small "n" size of four exiting preschoolers under category "b." CNMI therefore reviewed factors that possibly contributed to those preschoolers who exited the program under "c, d, and e" categories as the basis for determining possible reasons for slippage in 7C SS1. These categories included a total of 42 preschoolers (25 under c, 10 under d and 7 under e). The review considered factors that possibly contributed to the preschoolers improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations by the time they exited the program. The two data points used as factors for reasons for slippage were length of service and setting. The length of service data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations (categories c, d, and e) revealed that the majority or 54.76% (23/42) received more than 24 months of service. By categories, the data showed that all three categories reported at least 50% of the preschoolers received more than 24 months of service: "c"= 56.00% (14/25), "d"= 50.00% (5/10), and "e"= 57.14% (4/7). The setting data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations (categories c, d, and e) showed that the majority or 88.10% (37/42) of the exiting preschoolers were in Head Start or Private School. These settings are considered typical preschool classroom settings where other preschoolers without disabilities attend. It should be noted that all three categories reported at least 70% of the preschoolers attending Head Start or Private School: "c"= 88.00% (22/25); "d"= 100.00% (10/10); "e"= 71.43% (5/7). After reviewing the data for length of service and setting, stakeholders, including preschool program providers, discussed that how long services were provided and where preschoolers received services could be reasons for slippage in 7C SS1. As discussed earlier, the majority of exiting preschoolers under categories "c, d, and e" received services for more than 24 months and were in typical preschool classroom settings.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C2	CNMI's performance for FFY 2018 7C SS2 was 36.96% (17/46) of children who were functioning within age expectation in the area of use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. This represents slippage of 4.50% from CNMI's FFY 2017 performance of 41.46% (17/41). CNMI reviewed the following data points to identify possible reasons for slippage: Age of entry, length of service, disability, setting, and whether early intervention was received. In drilling down the data, CNMI reviewed factors that possibly contributed to those preschoolers who exited the program under "c, d, and e" categories as the basis for determining possible reasons for slippage in 7C SS2. These categories included a total of 42 preschoolers (25 under c, 10 under d and 7 under e). The review considered factors that possibly contributed to the preschoolers improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations by the time they exited the program. The two data points used as factors for reasons for slippage were length of service and setting. The length of service data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations (categories c, d, and e) revealed that the majority or 54.76% (23/42) received more than 24 months of service. By categories, the data showed that all three categories reported at least 50% of the preschoolers received more than 24 months of service: "c"= 56.00% (14/25), "d"= 50.00% (5/10), and "e"= 57.14% (4/7). The setting data for preschoolers who exited with improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers or within age expectations (categories c, d, and e) showed that the majority or 88.10% (37/42) of the exiting preschoolers were in Head Start or Private School. These settings are considered typical preschool classroom settings where other preschoolers without disabilities attend. It should be noted that all three categories reported at least 70% of the preschoolers attending Head Start or Private School: "c"= 88.00% (22/25); "d"= 100.00% (10/10); "e"= 71.43% (5/7). After reviewing the data for length of service and setting, stakeholders, including preschool program providers, discussed that how long services were provided could be a reason for slippage in 7C SS2. As discussed earlier, the majority of exiting preschoolers under category "c" received services for more than 24 months, but this majority represented 14 of the 25 preschoolers, which means 11 of the 25 preschoolers received less than 24 months of service.

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

Please explain why the State did not 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
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

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

Instruments and Procedures Used
All children eligible for Part B Early Childhood Special Education Services upon entry into the program and having received at least SIX months of services shall participate in the Early Childhood Special Education Outcome Measurement System process.

The Child Outcome Summary (COS) process consists of four key features of a quality. These features include --
• Uses 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

• Relies 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.

• Uses 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.

• Completes 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

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019.   The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	78.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%
Data	90.25%	90.65%	90.07%	91.34%	92.31%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
390	417	92.31%	90.00%	93.53%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

946

Percentage of respondent parents

44.08%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

The surveys were disseminated to all parents of students with disabilities, including preschool children with disabilities. Dissemination of the survey to parents of preschoolers with disabilities was done via the Head Start Program, which is housed in the elementary schools, or through the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teacher for those preschoolers with disabilities who receive special education and related services in home settings. The surveys included an introductory letter and a blank envelope to use when returning the completed surveys. Surveys disseminated via the Head Start Program were collected by the elementary school and those surveys provided to parents of preschoolers with disabilities receiving services in the home were collected by the ECSE teacher. All collected surveys were submitted in sealed envelopes to the Special Education Central Office, Data Manager. The individual surveys were then sent to the University of Guam CEDDERS for analysis of the data.

For preschoolers with disabilities, 103 surveys were disseminated; of which, 37 completed surveys were returned, representing 35.92% (37/103) parents of preschoolers with disabilities.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable
XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.
XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents
XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	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.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	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.

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

CNMI ensures that the survey response data are valid and reliable. The surveys were disseminated to all parents of children receiving special education services with an introductory letter and a blank envelope to use when returning the completed surveys. All collected surveys were submitted in sealed envelopes to the Special Education Central Office, Data Manager. The individual surveys were then sent to the University of Guam CEDDERS for analysis of the data.

FFY 2018 Indicator 8 data represent the demographics of children receiving special education services in the CNMI. In the CNMI, the majority of children with IEPs are Pacific Islanders, which was reflected in the parents who responded to the survey. The majority Pacific Islanders is also consistent with the overall demographics of the CNMI population.

Representation of the completed surveys was also examined through the percentage of surveys disseminated and returned by school levels and in each island within the CNMI, inclusive of parents of preschoolers with disabilities.

School Levels: All school levels were represented in the surveys disseminated and returned, with the majority of surveys disseminated and returned in the elementary level. Dissemination and returned percentages by school levels included:

Dissemination: 946 total surveys distributed by levels:
Preschool = 10.89% (103/946)
Elementary = 39.01% (369/946)
Junior High = 17.55% (166/946)
High School = 32.56% (308/946)

Returned: 417 total surveys returned by levels:
Preschool = 8.87% (37/417)
Elementary = 46.52% (194/417)
Junior High = 21.34% (89/417)

High School = 23.46% (97/417)

Island Representation: All three CNMI islands were represented in the surveys disseminated and returned. Overall, the majority of surveys disseminated and returned were from the island of Saipan. Dissemination and returned percentages by islands included:

Dissemination: 946 total surveys distributed in the three CNMI islands:
Saipan = 90.17% (853/946)
Rota = 5.81% (55/946)
Tinian = 4.02% (38/946)

Returned: 417 total surveys returned from the three CNMI islands:
Saipan = 86.81% (362/417)
Rota = 8.87% (37/417)
Tinian = 4.08% (17/417)
No island identified = 0.24% (1/417)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response
The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

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

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

Define "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).

NA

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.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NA

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target	NA	NA

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

NA

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	NA	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

NA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

NA

Define "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).

NA

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

NA

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

NA

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

NA

NA
Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
NA

NA
Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
NA
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
NA
NA
Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
NA

NA
Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
NA
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
NA
NA
Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
NA

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	53.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.17%	97.47%	98.45%	97.96%	99.11%

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
202	195	99.11%	100%	96.53%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

The FFY 2018 data indicate by 2.58%. In FFY 2017, only 2 initial evaluations were over the timeline. In FFY 2018, there was increase to 7 initial evaluation over the timeline. The majority of the over timeline evaluations (71.43% or 5/7) were from one school with a new teacher.   The reason for the delays was due to non-adherence of the referral procedures. Training was provided to the new teacher to ensure the referral procedures and initial evalautuon procedures are implemented correctly.

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

7

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.

Seven (7) evaluations were conducted over the 60 day timeline. The range of days over was 3 to 197 days. Although the evaluations were conducted over the timeline, all were completed. Of the 7, two (2) were determined not eligible. A file review of the 7 evaluations conducted over the timeline, the Reason for Delay form, indicate non-adherence to referral procedures. The majority of the evaluations over the over timeline were from one school with a new teacher, WSR.
School:
OES: 1 Non-adherence of Procedure (Eligible)
SNP: 1 Non-adherence of Procedure (Not Eligible)
WSR: 5 Non-adherence of Procedure (4 were eligible and 1 not eligible)
Total: 7

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

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, 2018 to June 30, 2019. 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 dates 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 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

CNMI verifies correction of findings, either timely or subsequent correction, through a review of the required initial evaluation data stipulated in the Written Notice of Findings, including individual instances and additional data demonstrating 100% compliance for verified correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. All special education data are inputted into the special education excel database, with reports generated by schools. The initial evaluation data sources are the actual initial evaluation documents submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database. Verification therefore is through a review of required documentation submitted to the PSS Special Education Program Office for input into the database.

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

As documented in the FFY 2017 performance data for Indicator 11, 2 initial evaluations from two 2 schools (1 private school and 1 public high school) 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. Through a review of subsequent data of actual initial evaluations, both schools were verified corrected and received a Written Notice of Timely Correction.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not demonstrate that it corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not report that that it verified that noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 is correctly implemented for the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data on the number of evaluations that were completed within 60 days subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	96.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	96.30%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	39
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	3
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	29

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.							7
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

	Numerator *(c)*	Denominator *(a-b-d-e-f)*	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	29	29	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	77.00%		
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
239	239	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

I. *Definitions*

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. *Data Reporting*

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

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

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

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	19.00%
A	10.00%	Data	24.00%	25.45%	16.98%	10.17%	12.24%
B	2009	Target >=	48.00%	52.00%	55.00%	58.00%	61.00%
B	62.00%	Data	48.00%	47.27%	37.74%	61.02%	48.98%
C	2009	Target >=	56.00%	63.00%	69.00%	75.00%	81.00%
C	86.00%	Data	56.00%	50.91%	43.40%	64.41%	61.22%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	20.00%	20.00%
Target B >=	63.00%	63.00%
Target C >=	87.00%	87.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

In FFY 2013, the CNMI primary stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2019 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2017 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 4   will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2020.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	62
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	10
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	35
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	2
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	10	62	12.24%	20.00%	16.13%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	45	62	48.98%	63.00%	72.58%	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)	47	62	61.22%	87.00%	75.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

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.

CNMI reports that the Indicator 14 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. CNMI's analysis of Indicator 14 response rate representation included a review of the total leavers and respondent leavers. There was a total of 69 leavers; of which 62 responded to the post-school outcomes survey, representing an 89.86% (62/69) return rate. The representation analysis included a review of the differences between the total leavers and respondent leavers for the exit, ethnicity, gender, and disability categories.

Exit Categories:

Total Leavers: Of the 69 leavers, 89.86% (62/69) represented exiters who graduated with a high school diploma and 10.14% (7/69) represented exiters who dropped out of high school.

Respondent Leavers: The 62 respondents included 93.55% (58/62) exiters who graduated with a high school diploma and 6.45% (4/62) who dropped out of high school. The two exit categories of the total leavers were represented by the respondent leavers, with the majority representing those who graduated with a high school diploma, similar to the total leavers population.

Ethnicity:

Total Leaver: Based on the IDEA ethnicity categories, the 69 leavers represented 68.12% (47/69) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders, 14.49% (10/69) Asians, and 17.39% (12/69) two or more races.

Respondent Leavers: Based on the IDEA ethnicity categories, the 62 respondents included 67.74% (42/62) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islanders, 16.13% (10/62) Asians, and 16.13% (10/62) two or more races. The respondent leavers represented similar ethnicity percentages when compared to the total leavers population.

Gender:

Total Leavers: Gender representation included 71.01% (49/69) males and 28.99% (20/69) females.

Respondent Leavers: The respondents included 72.58% (45/62) males and 27.42% (17/62) females. The respondent leavers represented similar percentages by gender when compared to the total leavers population.

Disability:

Total Leavers: The majority of leavers were identified as having a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) at 56.52% (39/69). There were seven other disability categories represented as leavers: HI, ID, TBI, MD, OHI, ED, and AUT, representing 43.48% (30/69) of the total leavers.

Respondent Leavers: The respondents included a majority representation of the SLD disability category at 58.06% (36/62); a similar percentage to the overall leaver SLD disability representation. All seven "other" disability categories were represented as respondents at 41.94% (26/62). By numbers, the 26 respondent "other" disability categories represented 86.67% (26/30) of the total leavers in the "other" disability category.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the 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, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

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

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input
XXX

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable
XXX
Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response
The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2018. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

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

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input
XXX

Historical Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Nora Pangelinan

Title:

Data and Compliance Program Manager

Email:

nora.pangelinan@cnmipss.org

Phone:

6704833933

Submitted on: