

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

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Northern Mariana Islands



PART C 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 infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. 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

The CNMI Public School System (PSS) is a unitary educational system responsible for the provision and supervision of early intervention service and support for infants and toddlers with disabilities on three populated islands. PSS is the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation, supervision, and monitoring of the Early Intervention Program (IDEA Part C). The Commissioner of Education (COE) is the PSS Chief State School Officer responsible for administering the IDEA Part C. This Executive Summary includes a description of CNMI's IDEA Part C 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, 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 November, 2019, stakeholders met to determine FFY 2019 targets. For FFY 2018 APR, the Early Intervention program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder involvement in the development of the CNMI IDEA Part C FFY 2018-2019 Annual Performance Report (APR). Stakeholders included the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), early intervention staff, parents, the Fiscal Personnel and Administration subcommittee, and the Board of Education. The review process included a discussion of OSEP's CNMI Part C determination letter issued on June 18, 2019, the RDA Matrix, HTDMD document, the 2019 Data Rubric Part C, the Dispute Resolution 2017-2018, and a Data Display. With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the stakeholders reviewed the performance data, national data for each indicator, and engaged in a discussion of each indicator's progress or slippage.

This FFY 2018 APR includes current performance data on 9 of the 11 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2018 data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2018 target, 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 2018 SPP/APR.

Although CNMI did not meet all its results targets in FFY 2018, the stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time. As required, for Indicator 11, CNMI's Part C State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), CNMI will submit its SSIP Phase III-Year 4, including a description and progress to date on the CNMI's Implementation and Evaluation Plans, no later than April 1, 2020.

Specific Conditions imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI for FFY 2019:

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

2. Actions taken as a result of the RMS technical assistance: CNMI submits a biannual report with updates on its administration of Department grant funds, with an emphasis on areas of repeat audit findings. In addition, the CNMI PSS has

- Increased communication and dialogue with Federal Fiscal Office;
- Improved information sharing regarding CNMI's longstanding non-compliance Special Conditions;
- Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years;
- Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Specific Conditions;
- Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years; and
- Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Special Conditions.

General Supervision System

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

The CNMI is a one level system that is both state and local program (there are no other programs that provide early intervention services in the CNMI). As part of the general supervision responsibility, PSS has mechanisms in place to identify and correct IDEA noncompliance and deficiencies within the Early Intervention (EI) system. The mechanism in place used to identify and correct noncompliances is an internal monitoring process that involves peer reviews, self-assessments, file reviews, data tracking, and child record reviews. Findings are analyzed to determine if the non-compliances is a system issue or individual EI Provider issue (failure to follow procedures or lack of documentation). Corrective measures are put in place to address any systemic issues and individual findings.

The CNMI monitoring system is a continuous and ongoing process that encompasses several components that serves a different function. The monitoring components include the "database," file reviews, the annual performance reports, self assessments, quality assurance reports, parent forums, and parent surveys and a "drill down process". When noncompliance is found, either through the database, file reviews or another component, every effort is made to correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year. When corrections are made, the correction is verified and that area is monitored several times during the report year to demonstrate continued correction. For noncompliance in a time sensitive process, the activity is completed immediately and the "root cause" is discussed to determine if there continues to be systemic issues or an individual provider issue. When corrections are made, the correction is verified and that area is monitored several times during the reporting year to demonstrate continued correction. 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 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 early intervention service (EIS) programs.

The PSS has a technical assistance system and mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based support provided to improve results for all infants and toddlers with disabilities such as the use of the Early Learning Guidelines, Case Tool Provider Checklist, and Tiers Of Intervention for Infants and Toddlers, and Early Childhood Family Coaching. The early childhood initiatives include TA provisions from National Centers, Regional Centers or local support such as the Guam CEDDERS. Due to the geographic location, accessing timely technical assistance support from Guam CEDDERS continues to meet the program's needs, in addition to the collaboration and support from Hawaii Part C Program for the Early

Childhood Family Coaching training.

The 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 specially on the Early Childhood Family Coaching, or in person on site assistance through Pacific Learning Collaborates or other venues. TA such as the IDEA Data Center for evaluating the SSIP plans and high quality data use, the DaSy Center for the collection and analysis of the Early Intervention and Special Education 619 data, the ECTA Center and NCSI for the improvement of Child Outcome Data, the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting are to assist with fiscal data collection and reporting requirements.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The CNMI has in place a system for professional development to ensure that service providers have the knowledge and skills to effectively provide Early Intervention (EI) services that will result in improved outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The PSS mechanism requires that all personnel participate in 10 professional development events. Two of the 10 days are statewide professional development, specific to PSS statewide changes and initiatives. Eight of the 10 days are specific to program level needs. The program coordinator, with technical assistance from Guam CEDDERS researched evidence-based practices that are culturally and linguistically appropriate in meeting the needs of the diverse island population.

The EI program continues to use the Early Childhood Intervention Competency Checklist. The purpose of this checklist is to maintain a systematic approach to assessing the knowledge and skills of all providers in supporting and strengthening parent competencies and confidence. Professional Development is ongoing and continues to focus on providing evidence based practices in supporting social emotional development and independence skills of infants and toddlers and their families. Continued Professional Development on the importance of on-going assessment and coaching skills are also a main focus. The EI program will continue to embed the Division of Early Childhood's Newly Recommended Practices as a resource and guide for providing effective and efficient EI services to improve the learning outcomes and promote the development of young children. EI providers annually provide training for primary referral sources such as physicians and child care providers on EI services (referral process, IFSP development, and transition processes). Annually, EI providers conduct presentations within the 3 islands to parents and other Early Childhood providers on overall child development, using the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Developmental Milestone Checklists, and in using the CNMI Early Learning Guidelines.

The Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) as indicated in the Part C Policies and Procedures revised in FFY 2012 includes training of parents, paraprofessionals, and primary referral sources with respect to the basic components of early intervention services available in the CNMI. The CSPD includes professional development to implement innovative strategies and activities to include but not limited to the following topical areas: 1) emotional and social development of young children; and 2) strategies to support families in participating fully in the development and implementation of the child's IFSP.

Stakeholder Involvement:

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Early Intervention Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement. Stakeholders participated by reviewing each indicator, its targets, performance, and trend data, as well as comparing National Data to that of the CNMI. For indicators that did not meet target, Stakeholders provided an in-depth discussion relating to the Indicators, and provided recommendations to assist with increasing performance. The Stakeholders did not revise any of the SPP/APR targets.

The Stakeholders included the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), the Public School System's Fiscal Personnel Administration (FPA) Committee, the State Board of Education (BOE), other early childhood serving agencies, early intervention service providers, and parents.

The review process included the following stakeholder input for the 2018-2019 SPP/APR development:

- August 2019: OSEP's Part C Determination Letter issued June 18, 2019 on compliance matrix, and current performance data for each indicator were disseminated to the Early Intervention Providers (Core SSIP Team). The stakeholders reviewed all Indicator targets and performance.
- August 2019: The Core SSIP team focused on Early Childhood Outcomes data and identified various reasons why the program did not meet 3 of the 6 targets and the reasons for slippage in the SiMR.
- September 2019: Early Intervention providers underwent Early Childhood Coaching Training and reviewed on-going SSIP activities.
- November 2019: The Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) through Leading by Convening, met to review OSEP's Part C Determination Letter issued June 18, 2019 on compliance matrix, and current performance data for each indicator all, indicator targets and performance with comparison to National Data. In addition, the ICC discussed and reviewed additional data presented on Indicators that displayed slippage to determine reasons "why" the Program did not meet the target. ICC members provided input on recommendations during the meeting. The meeting also focused on the implementation and evaluation of SSIP activities. In addition, the ICC also set targets for FFY 2019.
- January 2020: Fiscal Personnel Administration Subcommittees endorsed the Part C FFY 2018 APR and the Board of Education adopted the FFY 2018 Part C APR.
- January 2020: the ICC approved and certified the FFY 2018 APR.

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

NO

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program 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 §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

Annually, as soon as practicable or no later than 120 days following the CNMI submission of the APR, CNMI will post the GRADS360 generated SPP/APR pdf version for public posting and OSEP's Determination Letter and Response Table on the PSS website:

<https://www.cnmipss.org/student-support-services/>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 18, 2019 determination letter informed the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands received assistance; and (2) the actions the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands took as a result of that technical assistance. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided the required information.

The link that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided to the FFY 2017 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018) State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report for public reporting is not active.

The Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator C-11/State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and OSEP accepts that target.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

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. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Baseline | 2005 | 98.00% | | | |
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 96 | 96 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

0

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

The process used to collect the timely service start dates and monthly services dates is the Initial Start Date Form that is prepared by Early Intervention (EI) providers, signed by parents and submitted to the data manager. The form indicates the service, the agreed upon start date as is written on the IFSP, a revised start date if necessary, with an explanation based on the family's request, and the parent signature.

CNMI Definition of Timely Services:

The CNMI's definition of "Timely Services" is the "initial start-date" of each service listed on the IFSP which is consented to by parents. There are no other allowable time periods such as 30 days from when the parent consent to each service. Parents and EI providers decide the start date of each service. The discussion typically involves taking into consideration parents work schedules or events the child and family may be involved in or child care schedules.

The process used to verify the timely service start dates and monthly services dates is the Initial Service Documentation Form that is prepared by EI providers. The Initial Service Documentation Form includes the EI service, the expected start date, the actual start date and the parent signature. It also includes a Revised Start Date section, if applicable. This section is filled out when a family cancels a visit due to a valid family circumstance. A new revised start date is then identified by both the parent and the service provider. An explanation for the revised date and the parent signature is also required. Initial Service Documentation Forms are then submitted to the data manager on a monthly basis and information is inputted into the database. The data manager prints monthly reports that are submitted to the program coordinator for verification. Revised Initial Start Date's are also documented in the child's IFSP to reflect changes.

The process used to verify the timely service start dates and monthly services dates is the Initial Service Documentation Form that is prepared by EI providers. The Initial Service Documentation Form includes the EI service, the expected start date, the actual start date and the parent signature. It also includes a Revised Start Date section, if applicable. This section is filled out when a family cancels a visit due to a valid family circumstance. A new revised start date is then identified by both the parent and the service provider. An explanation for the revised date and the parent signature is also required. Initial Service Documentation Forms are then submitted to the data manager on a monthly basis and information is inputted into the database. The data manager prints monthly reports that are submitted to the program coordinator for verification. Revised Initial Start Date's are also documented in the child's IFSP to reflect changes.

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Timely Service Data reported for the period of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019 is taken from the database of the total count. Services include initial and any other services added to the IFSP during the report period.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The process used to verify the timely service start dates and monthly services dates is the Initial Service Documentation Form that is prepared by EI providers. The Initial Service Documentation Form includes the EI service, the expected start date, the actual start date and the parent signature. It also includes a Revised Start Date section, if applicable. This section is filled out when a family cancels a visit due to a valid family circumstance. A new revised start date is then identified by both the parent and the service provider. An explanation for the revised date and the parent signature is also required. Initial Service Documentation Forms are then submitted to the data manager on a monthly basis and information is inputted into the database. The data manager prints monthly reports that are submitted to the program coordinator for verification. Revised Initial Start Date's are also documented in the child's IFSP to reflect changes.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

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 FFY 2017 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

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] 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.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 95.00% | | | |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target>= | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.00% |
| Data | 98.67% | 96.25% | 96.23% | 100.00% | 97.10% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|----------|--------|--------|
| Target>= | 96.50% | 95.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Please see the Stakeholder Involvement description in the Introduction section.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|--|------------|---|------|
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 85 |
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 86 |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 85 | 86 | 97.10% | 96.50% | 98.84% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

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
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs 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 page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

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.

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 Process (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.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Please see the Stakeholder Involvement description in the Introduction section.

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----|----------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2008 | Target>= | 50.00% | 55.00% | 60.00% | 65.00% | 70.00% |
| A1 | 75.00% | Data | 50.00% | 85.71% | 40.00% | 56.25% | 78.57% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target>= | 65.00% | 65.00% | 66.00% | 66.00% | 66.00% |
| A2 | 64.00% | Data | 77.78% | 82.76% | 67.31% | 72.73% | 59.38% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target>= | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% | 68.00% | 69.00% |
| B1 | 54.20% | Data | 81.25% | 75.00% | 46.34% | 60.00% | 81.25% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target>= | 50.00% | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% |
| B2 | 32.00% | Data | 66.67% | 58.62% | 38.46% | 38.64% | 34.38% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target>= | 82.00% | 82.00% | 82.50% | 82.50% | 83.00% |
| C1 | 81.80% | Data | 92.31% | 93.33% | 68.75% | 78.26% | 86.21% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target>= | 61.00% | 65.00% | 69.00% | 73.00% | 75.00% |
| C2 | 76.00% | Data | 61.11% | 82.76% | 71.15% | 72.73% | 62.50% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| Target A1>= | 75.10% | 75.10% |
| Target A2>= | 66.00% | 65.00% |
| Target B1>= | 70.00% | 70.00% |
| Target B2>= | 55.00% | 50.00% |
| Target C1>= | 83.00% | 82.00% |
| Target C2>= | 77.00% | 65.00% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

56

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

| | Number of children | Percentage of Total |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 5 | 9.09% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 25 | 45.45% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 16 | 29.09% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 9 | 16.36% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program | 41 | 46 | 78.57% | 75.10% | 89.13% | Met Target | No Slippage |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | | | | | | | |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 25 | 55 | 59.38% | 66.00% | 45.45% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

There were 25 out of 56 infants and toddlers or 44.6% that reached or maintained functioning within age expectation in the area of positive social emotional skills. This is a slippage of 14.8% in the performance from FFY 2017 of 59.4%. CNMI did not meet the target of 66% for this year.

The stakeholders reviewed and analyzed specific data such as age of entry, years of service, disability, race or ethnicity as possible reasons why 26 or 46.4% of the children that exited were in category “c” - Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-age peers but did not reach it.

- Age at entry.
 - o 3 were enrolled in the program between 1 to 11 months of age;
 - o 9 out of 26 were enrolled between 12 to 23 months of age; and
 - o 14 out of 26 were enrolled before 24 to 36 months of age
- Service time.
 - o 13 out of the 26 received less than 11 months of services;
 - o 10 out of the 26 between 12 to 24 months of services; and
 - o 3 received between 25 and 36 months of services

- Disability category.
 - o 15 were eligible as established condition
 - o 11 with developmental delays

Further drill down was reviewed noting the following increase of ratings of the 26 children that were in category “c”

- 15 of the 26 children increased by 1 rating
- 6 children increased by 2 ratings
- 4 children increased by 3 rating
- 1 child increased by 4 ratings

Stakeholders reviewed the types of services and the number of services identified in the IFSP for the children that were in category “c”.

- Types of Services:
 - o 21 children receive Special Instruction
 - o 6 received Speech and Language Services
 - o 4 received Physical Therapy
 - o 3 received Telehealth for speech services
 - o 2 children received Occupational Therapy
 - o 1 child received Audiological services
- Number of EI Services indicated in the child’s IFSP
 - o 17 of the 26 children received one service indicated in the IFSP
 - o 6 children received 2 types of services indicated in the IFSP
 - o 3 children received 3 types of services

During the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) SSIP Input Session, members reviewed the data for this specific indicator and noted that due to the small “n” (number) cautions should be taken when noting the performance in percentages. For this reporting period, there are several factors that were identified in the data drill down – 1) the majority of the children are entering in the early intervention program the age between 12 to 33 months of age; 2) children are accessing early intervention services for 12 to 24 months; and 3) there is a high number of missed services, for example 13 out of the 26 children had documented missed services due to the typhoons that hit the CNMI. As of this reporting period, over 75% of the homes were severely damaged from the typhoons as reported in the media on October 2019, the first home in Saipan was rebuilt with the federal assistance. Having said that, there are still many families that are living in tents waiting for federal assistance and the completion of their homes to be rebuilt.

Stakeholders discussed the difference between cultural and western standards of child development and the changing perceptions of the home as a need to provide more awareness and information to parents. In April 2019, the EI Program held parent training on the early childhood coaching model that providers are using at each home visit. The overall results of the parent night were positive as now families understand the strategies providers will use to encourage parents to actively participate in using sets of strategies to support their child’s development within their daily routine. The following are parents’ testimony of the early childhood model:

- I like the information and the sharing of thoughts with parents with same situations.
- The Latte Coaching Plan I like how we get to fill out what we are planning to do and the plans we have.
- They showed us what we can all do to help our kids/baby achieve their goals.

Overall, the Stakeholders indicated that the data is showing growth with positive effects that is impacted by the Program indicating children have increased in their rate of growth. This notion was validated by the review of trend data for the past 3 years which showed an increase each year in the performance of children exiting the program in categories “c, d, and e”. In addition, the Part C Director shared that as part of the Part C Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), the Program had developed an AIM statement with this specific focus. The Program aligned the procedures to ensure the levels of support a child may need in the IFSP is reflected in the Tiers for Intervention (TOI) process and identifies specific strategies to support the child and family. The strategies include the following:

- Show parents how they could track their child’s development through the CDC Developmental Tracker Apps or provide a copy of the Moments Booklet, so parents are empowered on how they could ensure their children are meeting their milestones; and
- Target specific training in this area to assist children reach social emotional skills like same peers.

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

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 7 | 12.50% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 32 | 57.14% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 14 | 25.00% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 5.36% |

| | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | 46 | 53 | 81.25% | 70.00% | 86.79% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 17 | 56 | 34.38% | 55.00% | 30.36% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

There were 17 out of 56 infants and toddlers or 30.4% reach or maintained functioning within age expectation in the area of acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication; and early literacy). This is a slippage of 4% in the performance from FFY 2017 of 34.40%. CNMI did not meet the target of 55% for this year.

The stakeholder reviewed and analyzed specific data such as age of entry, years of service, disability, race or ethnicity as possible reasons why 32 or 57.1% of the children that exited were in category “c” - Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-age peers but did not reach it.

- Age at entry.
 - o 5 were enrolled in the program between 1 to 11 months of age;
 - o 12 out of 32 were enrolled between 12 to 23 months of age; and
 - o 15 out of 32 were enrolled before 24 to 36 months of age
- Service time.
 - o 14 out of 32 received less than 11 months of services;
 - o 14 out of 32 received between 12 to 24 months of services; and
 - o 4 received between 25 and 36 months of services

- Disability category.
 - o 17 were eligible as established condition
 - o 15 with developmental delays

Further drill down was reviewed on the types of services and the number of services identified in the IFSP for the children that were in category “c”.

- Types of Services:
 - o 30 of the 32 children receive Special Instruction
 - o 6 received Speech and Language Services

- o 4 received Physical Therapy
- o 3 received Telehealth for Speech Services
- o 4 children received Occupational Therapy
- o 1 child received Audiological Services

- Number of EI Services indicated in the child's IFSP
 - o 20 of the 32 children received one service indicated in the IFSP
 - o 8 children received 2 types of services indicated in the IFSP
 - o 4 children received 3 types of services

During the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) SSIP Input Session, members reviewed the data for this specific indicator and noted that due to the small "n" (number) cautions should be taken when noting the performance in percentages. For this reporting period, there are several factors that were identified in the data drill down – 1) the majority of the children are entering in the early intervention program the age between 12 to 33 months of age; 2) children are accessing early intervention services for 12 to 24 months; and 3) there is a high number of missed services, for example 12 out of the 32 children had documented missed services due to the typhoons that hit the CNMI. As of this reporting period, over 75% of the homes were severely damaged from the typhoons as reported in the media on October 2019, the first home in Saipan was rebuilt with the federal assistance. Having said that, there are still many families that are living in tents waiting for federal assistance and the completion of their homes to be rebuilt.

Stakeholders discussed the difference between cultural and western standards of child development and the changing perceptions of the home as a need to provide more awareness and information to parents. In April 2019, the EI Program held parent training on the early childhood coaching model that providers are using at each home visit. The overall results of the parent night were positive as now families understand the strategies providers will use to encourage parent to be actively participate in using sets of strategies to support their child's development within their daily routine. The following are parents' testimony of the early childhood model:

- It really help all the parents about their own kids own support.
- Learning new coaching skills.
- Learning how important it is to praise and encourage our children daily.

Overall, the Stakeholders indicated that the data is showing growth with positive effects that is impacted by the Program indicating children have increased in their rate of growth. This notion was validated by the review of trend data for the past 3 years which showed an increase each year in the performance of children exiting the program in categories "c, d, and e". In addition, the Part C Director shared that as part of the Part C Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), the Program had developed an AIM statement with this specific focus. The Program aligned the procedures to ensure the levels of support a child may need in the IFSP is reflected in the Tiers for Intervention (TOI) process and identifies specific strategies to support the child and family. The strategies include the following:

- Show parents on how they could track their child's development through the CDC Developmental Tracker Apps or provide a copy of the Moments Booklet, so parents are empowered on how they could ensure their children are meeting their milestones; and
- Target specific training on strategies for supporting the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the area of early literacy, language, and communication that parents and providers could work on more intentionally.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 13 | 23.21% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 21 | 37.50% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 13 | 23.21% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 9 | 16.07% |

| | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | 34 | 47 | 86.21% | 83.00% | 72.34% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 22 | 56 | 62.50% | 77.00% | 39.29% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

For FFY 2018, there were 56 infants and toddlers with IFSPs that participated in this measurement. Thirteen or 23.2% of the children that exited were in categories "b" children who improved functioning but not to move nearer to functioning compared to same age peers in the area of use appropriate

behaviors to meet their needs.

CNMI's performance for this year is 72.3% 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. This is a slippage of 13.9% in comparison to FFY 2017 performance of 86.2%.

The stakeholder reviewed and analyzed specific data to such as age of entry, years of service, disability, race or ethnicity as possible reasons why 13 of the children that exited were in category "b" - children who improved functioning but not to move nearer to functioning compared to same age peers.

Age at entry.

- o 3 were enrolled in the program between 1 to 11 months of age;
- o 3 out of 13 were enrolled between 12 to 23 months of age; and
- o 7 out of 13 were enrolled before 24 to 36 months of age

• Service time.

- o 7 out of 13 received less than 11 months of services;
- o 5 received between 12 to 24 months of services; and
- o 1 received between 25 and 36 months of services

• Disability category.

- o 10 were eligible as established condition
- o 3 with developmental delays

Further drill down was reviewed on the types of services and the number of services identified in the IFSP for the children that were in category "c".

• Types of Services:

- o 11 of the 13 children receive Special Instruction
- o 2 children received Speech and Language Services
- o 4 children received Physical Therapy

• Number of EI Services indicated in the child's IFSP

- o 9 of the 13 children received one service indicated in the IFSP
- o 4 children received 2 types of services indicated in the IFSP

During the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) SSIP Input Session, members reviewed the data for this specific indicator and noted that due to the small "n" (number) cautions should be taken when noting the performance in percentages. For this reporting period, there are several factors that were identified in the data drill down – 1) the majority of the children are entering in the early intervention program the age between 12 to 33 months of age; 2) children are accessing early intervention services for 12 to 24 months; and 3) there is a high number of missed services, for example 8 out of the 13 children had documented missed services due to the typhoons that hit the CNMI As of this reporting period, over 75% of the homes were severely damaged from the typhoons as reported in the media on October 2019, the first home in Saipan was rebuilt with the federal assistance. Having said that, there are still many families that are living in tents waiting for federal assistance and the completion of their homes to be rebuilt.

Stakeholders discussed the difference between cultural and western standards of child development and the changing perceptions of the home as a need to provide more awareness and information to parents. In April 2019, the EI Program held parent training on the early childhood coaching model that providers are using at each home visit. The overall results of the parent night were positive as now families understand the strategies providers will use to encourage parent to be actively participate in using sets of strategies to support their child's development within their daily routine. The following are parents' testimony of the early childhood model:

- I'm better informed of what to expect from the coach/teacher.
- The sharing among parents. [Because]...we learn new things/strategies.
- Learning new coaching skills!

Overall, the Stakeholders indicated that the data is showing growth with positive effects that is impacted by the Program indicating children have increased in their rate of growth. This notion was validated by the review of trend data for the past 3 years which showed an increase each year in the performance of children exiting the program in categories "c, d, and e". In addition, the Part C Director shared that as part of the Part C Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), the Program had developed an AIM with this specific focus. The Program aligned the procedures to ensure the levels of support a child may need in the IFSP is reflected in the Tiers for Intervention (TOI) process and identifies specific strategies to support the child and family. The strategies include the following:

- Show parents how they could track their child's development through the CDC Developmental Tracker Apps or provide a copy of the Moments Booklet, so parents are empowered on how they could ensure their children are meeting their milestones; and
- Target specific training on strategies for supporting the children to use appropriate behavior to meet their needs, such as self-help skills that parents, and providers could work on more intentionally.

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

There were 21 out of 56 infants and toddlers or 37.5% reach or maintained functioning within age expectation in the area of use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. This is a slippage of 25% in the performance from FFY 2017 of 62.5%. CNMI did not meet the target of 72% for this year.

The stakeholder reviewed and analyzed specific data such as age of entry, years of service, disability, race or ethnicity as possible reasons why 21 or 37.5% of the children that exited were in category "c" - Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-age peers but did not reach it.

• Age at entry.

- o 5 out of 21 were enrolled in the program between 1 to 11 months of age;
- o 8 were enrolled between 12 to 23 months of age; and
- o 8 were enrolled before 24 to 36 months of age

• Service time.

- o 8 out of the 21 received less than 11 months of services;
- o 9 received between 12 to 24 months of services; and
- o 4 received between 25 and 36 months of services

- Disability category.
 - o 12 were eligible as established condition
 - o 9 with developmental delays

Further drill down was reviewed on the types of services and the number of services identified in the IFSP for the children that were in category “c”.

- Types of Services:
 - o 17 of the 21 children receive Special Instruction
 - o 1 child received Speech and Language Services
 - o 6 children received Physical Therapy
 - o 4 received Telehealth for Speech Services
 - o 4 children received Occupational Therapy
 - o 1 child received Audiological Services
- Number of EI Services indicated in the child’s IFSP
 - o 14 of the 21 children received one service indicated in the IFSP
 - o 2 children received 2 types of services indicated in the IFSP
 - o 5 children received 3 types of services

During the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) SSIP Input Session, members reviewed the data for this specific indicator and noted that due to the small “n” (number) cautions should be taken when noting the performance in percentages. For this reporting period, there are several factors that were identified in the data drill down – 1) the majority of the children are entering in the early intervention program the age between 12 to 33 months of age; 2) children are accessing early intervention services for 12 to 24 months; and 3) there is a high number of missed services, for example 7 out of the 21 children had documented missed services due to the typhoons that hit the CNMI. As of this reporting period, over 75% of the homes were severely damaged from the typhoons as reported in the media on October 2019, the first home in Saipan was rebuilt with the federal assistance. Having said that, there are still many families that are living in tents waiting for federal assistance and the completion of their homes to be rebuilt.

Stakeholders discussed the difference between cultural and western standards of child development and the changing perceptions of the home as a need to provide more awareness and information to parents. In April 2019, the EI Program held parent training on the early childhood coaching model that providers are using at each home visit. The overall results of the parent night were positive as now families understand the strategies providers will use to encourage parent to be actively participate in using sets of strategies to support their child’s development within their daily routine. The following are parents’ testimony of the early childhood model:

- That the people can help us of what we can do, and how are we going to help our baby to improve.
- It was awesome! Got to learn new ideas.
- Thank you for the time you guys give to help us better understand our child’s needs.

Overall, the Stakeholders indicated that the data is showing growth with positive effects that is impacted by the Program indicating children have increased in their rate of growth. This notion was validated by the review of trend data for the past 3 years which showed an increase each year in the performance of children exiting the program in categories “c, d, and e”. In addition, the Part C Director shared that as part of the Part C Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), the Program had developed an AIM statement with this specific focus. The Program aligned the procedures to ensure the levels of support a child may need in the IFSP is reflected in the Tiers for Intervention (TOI) process and identifies specific strategies to support the child and family. The strategies include the following:

- Show parents how they could track their child’s development through the CDC Developmental Tracker Apps or provide a copy of the Moments Booklet, so parents are empowered on how they could ensure their children are meeting their milestones; and
- Target specific training on strategies for supporting the children to use appropriate behavior to meet their needs, such as self-help skills that parents, and providers could work on more intentionally.

Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?

XXX

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------|----------|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A1 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A1 AR | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A1 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 AR | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B1 | XXX | Target>= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| B1 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B1 AR | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B1 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 AR | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C1 | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C1 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C1 AR | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C1 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 AR | XXX | Target >= | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2 AR | XXX | Data | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Target A1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| A1 AR | XXX | |
| Target A2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| A2 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target B1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| B1 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target B2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| B2 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target C1 >= | XXX | XXX |
| C1 AR | XXX | XXX |
| Target C2 >= | XXX | XXX |
| C2 AR | XXX | XXX |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

XXX

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

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | Number of children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | Number of children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | Number of children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | Number of Children | Percentage of Total |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | XXX | XXX |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | XXX | XXX |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | XXX | XXX |

| Not including at-risk infants and toddlers | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | 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 3 years of age or exited the program | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |

| Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| turned 3 years of age or exited the program | | | | | | | |

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

| | |
|---|----|
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data | 73 |
| The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. | 17 |

| | Yes / No |
|--|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| 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

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

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

CNMI Early Childhood Outcome Procedures:

All children, age 6 months or older, that receive at least 6 months of early intervention services, participate in Early Childhood Outcomes.

The Child Outcome Summary (COS) process consist 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 IFSP and therefore, collecting child assessment information is currently part of the IFSP 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:

- The Hawaii Early Learning Profile
- Other assessment results if appropriate
- Parent and other caregiver information
- Child observations
- 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 participates 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 Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Center recommends not correcting for prematurity. At a later age, the child's functioning may show a higher rating, reflecting that the child has now caught up with age expectations. 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)

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for Indicator 3 summary statements A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1, but OSEP cannot accept the target for summary statement C2 because the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' end target for FFY 2019 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands must revise its FFY 2019 target for Indicator 3 summary statement C2 to reflect improvement.

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C 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 page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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 families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, 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 families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| | Baseline | FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|---|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2006 | Target >= | 92.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% | 93.00% | 94.00% |
| A | 94.00% | Data | 96.30% | 97.89% | 96.46% | 97.56% | 97.76% |
| B | 2006 | Target >= | 92.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% | 93.00% | 94.00% |
| B | 93.00% | Data | 96.30% | 97.89% | 97.35% | 98.78% | 99.25% |
| C | 2006 | Target >= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 93.00% |
| C | 94.00% | Data | 93.52% | 94.74% | 97.35% | 92.68% | 97.76% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|-------------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 94.10% | 94.00% |
| Target B >= | 94.00% | 94.00% |
| Target C >= | 94.10% | 94.10% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Please see the Stakeholder Involvement description in the Introduction section.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|-----|
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 162 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 156 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 159 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 162 |
| B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 156 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 162 |
| C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 159 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 162 |

| | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 97.76% | 94.10% | 98.15% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 99.25% | 94.00% | 96.30% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 97.76% | 94.10% | 98.15% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part B slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for part C slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

| | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Was a collection tool used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool? | NO |
| If your collection tool has changed, upload it here | XXX |
| The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. | YES |

If not, 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 analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

As per OSEP's instructions, the CNMI Part C Family Survey used for 2008 - 2009 is not attached because the same survey was used and provided in the FFY 2006 APR. The family survey instruments were distributed to all families who received services during this reporting year, including families who may have exited prior to the December 1 child count. The surveys were disseminated in 3 "respondent groups:"

- "New" representing families who received services for 6 months or less,
- "Ongoing" for families who received services for more than 6 months but less than 30 months, and
- "Exiting" for families who received services for at least 30 months.

Families were asked to respond to each survey statement by choosing a number from 1 through 5 that represented their level of disagreement or

agreement with the statement. The "New" survey included statements related to the knowledge and skills of families entering the program. The "Ongoing" survey items included statements that reflected the expectations of receiving continued services, including 6-month and annual IFSP reviews. The "Exiting" survey included specific statements related to transition.

There are three measurements that are collected and reported based on survey results pertaining to parents reporting how early intervention services have helped the family:

Know their rights;
Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
Help their children to develop and learn

These families or "respondent groups" were representative of the population served in the CNMI, which included families from the islands of Saipan, Rota, and Tinian.

For this reporting period, the total number of surveys that were received:

61 of 61 New surveys received
43 of 43 On going surveys received
52 of 58 Exiting surveys received

Total: 156 surveys received or 96.2% out of 162

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4 - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands revised its targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for B and C, but OSEP cannot accept the target for A because the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' end target for FFY 2019 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands must revise its FFY 2019 target for A to reflect improvement.

4 - Required Actions

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] 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 and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Baseline | 2005 | 0.85% | | | |
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | 0.92% | 0.92% | 0.93% | 0.93% | 0.94% |
| Data | 1.77% | 0.75% | 0.56% | 1.03% | 1.77% |

Targets

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
| Target >= | 0.95% | 1.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Please see Stakeholder input on Introduction section

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 12 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/20/2019 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 1,072 |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 12 | 1,072 | 1.77% | 0.95% | 1.12% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The CNMI performed at 1.12% while National was at 1.25%. The CNMI performed .13% below the National Average.

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

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] 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 and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Baseline | 2005 | 1.58% | | | |
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target >= | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.10% | 2.10% | 2.20% |
| Data | 2.33% | 2.49% | 1.65% | 1.87% | 2.15% |

Targets

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
| Target >= | 2.20% | 2.20% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

Please see stakeholder input in Introduction section.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 07/10/2019 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 86 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin | 06/20/2019 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 3,216 |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 86 | 3,216 | 2.15% | 2.20% | 2.67% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data

The CNMI performed at 2.67% compared to National at 3.48%. The CNMI performed .81% below the National average.

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

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

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 actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 98.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FFY | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2018 | 2019 |
|--------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

| Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline | Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 76 | 76 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The reporting period is from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The Children’s Developmental Assistance Center is the entry point for all referrals. When referrals are received from any referral source, the Data Manager posts the referral date and referral source into the database. The database automatically generates the 45-day timeline that the evaluation and initial IFSP meeting must occur. The Data Manager disseminates the “referral” information to Service Coordinators on a rotating basis. The Service Coordinators make initial contact with the family and schedule Initial evaluation and IFSP dates and locations.

Upon completion of the evaluation and initial IFSP meetings, these documents are submitted to the Data Manager for verification and posting in the database. The database is formatted to “red flag” dates that fall outside the 45-day timeline. For any “delays” in the process, or red flags, a Reason for Delay form is also submitted to the Data Manager. The Data Manager “determines” if the reason is due to an exceptional family circumstance, or a systemic issue. The “valid” or “invalid” reason is also logged into the database. At the end of the reporting year, the Data Manager draws down the data for inclusion in the APR.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

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 FFY 2017 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

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 100.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

| Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 47 | 47 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

0

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The reporting period is from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

In the CNMI, children eligible for Part B services are defined as those children who, based on current evaluation, assessment and IFSP information, continue to demonstrate a 25% delay in one or more areas of development or have an established condition that has a high probability resulting in a disability that aligns with the Part B eligibility definitions or categories and because of that condition or disability, the child may need special education and related services. The determination of whether the child is potentially eligible for Part B is made by that toddler's IFSP team. Part B eligibility is determined by the Part B providers. Individual "referral notice" is sent to the Special Education Program which triggers the Part B child find process. Upon parental consent to release information, pertinent information such as evaluation reports, current IFSPs, Outcome Measurement information, and other information is sent to the Special Education Program team to prepare for the transition conference. Upon approval of the parent, a Transition Conference is scheduled and meeting invitations are sent to receiving special education teams and the preschool providers. The CNMI does not have an "opt out" policy for parents to opt out of the referral. Service Coordinators are required to submit all documentation related to the transition requirements to the Data Manager. This includes copies of the referral to special education, copies of the invitation of the Transition Conference meeting, copies of the Prior Written Notices, the IFSP Transition Steps and Service Plan, and the Transition Conference notes. The Data Manager verifies the information contained in the IFSP and "dates" before posting the data in the database. The database includes the date of the LEA (Special Education Program) notification, the date steps and services were discussed with the family, the date of the Transition Conference with Early Childhood Special Education providers, and the age of the child on the conference date. The database is formatted to red flag less than 90 days from the Transition Conference date and third birthday. The database now includes timeline requirements for LEA notification and Steps and Services in the Transition Plan. For any Transition Conferences held less than 90 days from the third birthday, a Reason or Delay form is attached and submitted to the Data Manager. The Data Manager is responsible to verify the reasons and makes a determination of valid (exceptional family circumstance) or invalid (system issue).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

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 FFY 2017 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

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.
- Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.
- Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 100.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 47 | 47 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

Service Coordinators are required to submit all documentation related to the transition requirements to the Data Manager. This includes copies of the referral to special education, copies of the invitation of the Transition Conference meeting, copies of the Prior Written Notices, the IFSP Transition Steps and Service Plan, and the Transition Conference notes. The Data Manager verifies the information contained in the IFSP and "dates" before posting the data in the database. The database includes the date of the LEA (Special Education Program) notification, the date the steps and services were discussed with the family, the date of the Transition Conference with EC SPED providers, and the age of the child on the conference date. The database is formatted to red flag less than 90 days from the Transition Conference date and third birthday. The Database now includes timeline requirements for LEA notification and Steps and Services in the Transition Plan. For any Transition Conferences held less than 90 days from the third birthday, a Reason or Delay form is attached and submitted to the Data Manager. The Data Manager is responsible to verify the reasons and makes a determination of valid (exceptional family circumstance) or invalid (system issue).

Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The data reporting period is from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

In the CNMI, children potentially eligible for Part B services are defined as those children who, based on current evaluation, assessment and IFSP information, continue to demonstrate a 25% delay in one or more areas of development or have an established condition that has a high probability of resulting in a disability that aligns with the Part B eligibility definitions or categories and because of that condition or disability, the child may need special education and related services. The determination of whether the child is potentially eligible for Part B is made by that toddler's IFSP team. Part B eligibility is determined by the Part B providers. Individual "referral notice" is sent to the Special Education Program which triggers the Part B child find process. Upon parental consent to release information, pertinent information such as evaluation reports, current IFSPs, Outcome Measurement information, and other information is sent to the Special Education Program team to prepare for the transition conference. Upon approval of the parent, a Transition Conference is scheduled and meeting invitations are sent to receiving special education teams and the preschool providers. The CNMI does not have an "opt out" policy for parents to opt out of the referral. Service Coordinators are required to submit all documentation related to the transition requirements to the Data Manager. This includes copies of the referral to special education, copies of the invitation of the Transition Conference meeting, copies of the Prior Written Notices, the IFSP Transition Steps and Service Plan, and the Transition Conference notes. The Data Manager verifies the information contained in the IFSP and "dates" before posting the data in the database. The database includes the date of the LEA (Special Education Program) notification, the date steps and services were discussed with the family, the date of the Transition Conference with EC SPED providers, and the age of the child on the conference date. The database is formatted to red flag less than 90 days from the Transition Conference date and third birthday. The database now includes timeline requirements for LEA notification and Steps and Services in the Transition Plan. For any Transition Conferences held less than 90 days from the third birthday, a Reason or Delay form is attached and submitted to the Data Manager. The Data Manager is responsible to verify the reasons and makes a determination of valid (exceptional family circumstance) or invalid (system issue)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

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 FFY 2017 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

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline | 2005 | 100.00% | | | |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B | FFY 2017 Data | FFY 2018 Target | FFY 2018 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 47 | 47 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

0

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The reporting period is from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

In the CNMI, children potentially eligible for Part B services are defined as those children who, based on current evaluation, assessment and IFSP information, continue to demonstrate a 25% delay in one or more areas of development or have an established condition that has a high probability of resulting in a disability that aligns with the Part B eligibility definitions or categories and because of that condition or disability, the child may need special education and related services. The determination of whether the child is potentially eligible for Part B is made by that toddler's IFSP team. Part B eligibility is determined by the Part B providers. Individual "referral notice" is sent to the Special Education Program which triggers the Part B child find process. Upon parental consent to release information, pertinent information such as evaluation reports, current IFSPs, Outcome Measurement information, and other information is sent to the Special Education Program team to prepare for the transition conference. Upon approval of the parent, a Transition Conference is scheduled and meeting invitations are sent to receiving special education teams and the preschool providers. The CNMI does not have an "opt out" policy for parents to opt out of the referral. Service Coordinators are required to submit all documentation related to the transition requirements to the Data Manager. This includes copies of the referral to special education, copies of the invitation of the Transition Conference meeting, copies of the Prior Written Notices, the IFSP Transition Steps and Service Plan, and the Transition Conference notes. The Data Manager verifies the information contained in the IFSP and "dates" before posting the data in the database. The database includes the date of the LEA (Special Education Program) notification, the date steps and services were discussed with the family, the date of the Transition Conference with EC SPED providers, and the age of the child on the conference date. The database is formatted to red flag less than 90 days from the Transition Conference date and third birthday. The database now includes timeline requirements for LEA notification and Steps and Services in the Transition Plan. For any Transition Conferences held less than 90 days from the third birthday, a Reason or Delay form is attached and submitted to the Data Manager. The Data Manager is responsible to verify the reasons and makes a determination of valid (exceptional family circumstance) or invalid (system issue).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

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 FFY 2017 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

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

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, the State must develop baseline and targets and report 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 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

The CNMI reported no resolution sessions during this reporting period. The CNMI reported fewer than 10 resolution session held FY 2018. The CNMI is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which 10 or more resolutions are held.

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

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.

Prepopulated Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

XXX

The CNMI reported no resolution sessions during this reporting period. The CNMI reported fewer than 10 resolution session held FY 2018. The CNMI is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which 10 or more resolutions are held.

Historical Data

| Baseline | | | | | |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 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)

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - 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.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = $((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1) \text{ times } 100$.

Instructions

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

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report 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 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

Prepopulated Data

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

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)

The CNMI reported no mediations were held during this reporting period. The CNMI reported fewer than 10 mediations held FY 2018. The CNMI is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which 10 or more mediations are held.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - 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.

10 - 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 Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role

Lead Agency Director

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

Name:

robin palacios

Title:

director, early intervention

Email:

robin.palacios@cnmipss.org

Phone:

670-664-4841

Submitted on: