

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Northern Mariana Islands



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary includes a description of CNMI's IDEA Part B FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). A description of the CNMI's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System and Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR and how the CNMI will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of CNMI's SPP/APR.

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

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9, and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Indicator 17, the SSIP Core Team, along with other stakeholders met to review baseline data and performance data.

Specific Conditions continued to be imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI for FFY 2021. The CNMI must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which the CNMI received assistance; and
- (2) the actions the CNMI took as a result of that technical assistance

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

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

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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

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

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

Technical Assistance System:

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

The CNMI PSS has a technical assistance system and mechanisms in place to ensure timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based support is provided to improve results for children with disabilities. Over the past few years, the PSS has implemented several system wide initiatives intended to improve results for all students. PSS also accesses and benefits from universal technical assistance provided by OSEP and OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources, either through publications, guidance tools, resource materials, monthly conference calls and webinars, or in person on site assistance through Pacific Learning Collaboratives or other venues. TA Centers such as NCSI for work on the SIMR, IDEA Data Center for evaluating the SSIP plans and high-quality data use, the DaSy Center and ECTA for the collection and analysis of the Early Intervention and Special Education preschool

outcomes data, NCEO for inclusion in instruction and assessments, and CIFR for IDEA fiscal requirements related to the maintenance of state financial support. PSS also contracts with the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (Guam CEDDERS) for targeted onsite and offsite technical assistance.

Professional Development System:

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

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

In school year 2021-2022, the office of Student Support Services and the office of Curriculum and Instruction engaged in several focus areas for improvement and included a focus on PD:

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

Broad Stakeholder Input:

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

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

22

Parent Members Engagement:

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

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

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

In school year 2021-2022, the public school system conducted a parent summit to share the PSS strategic Performance Management goals, state wide assessment data and other topics of interest focused on building their knowledge and skills around mental health, Cyber bullying, and health. School level parent nights were held at two schools for parents of students with disabilities to share resources and gather input and concerns regarding the services being provided. Each school hosts quarterly Parent Teacher meetings to share school level data, information, activities and services being provided. And lastly, the special education program recruited more diverse group of parents to become members of the Special Education State Advisory Panel.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

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

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The CNMI's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the CNMI's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the CNMI of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the CNMI to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the CNMI to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The CNMI must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the CNMI received assistance; and (2) the actions the CNMI took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Specific Conditions continued to be imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI for FFY 2021. The CNMI must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which the CNMI received assistance; and
- (2) the actions the CNMI took as a result of that technical assistance

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

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

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

Intro - OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' (CNMI's) determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed CNMI that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which CNMI received assistance; and (2) the actions CNMI took as a result of that technical assistance. CNMI provided the required information.

The Department imposed Specific Conditions on CNMI's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years. Those conditions are in effect at the time of the Department's 2023 determination.

Intro - Required Actions

CNMI's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In CNMI's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised CNMI of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required CNMI to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed CNMI to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. CNMI must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which CNMI received assistance; and (2) the actions CNMI took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	76.39%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	78.00%		80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	82.00%	76.39%	89.86%	90.77%	95.52%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year’s performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI’s context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP’s instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year’s performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP’s instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	57

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
57	62	95.52%	80.00%	91.94%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	8.06%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	8.78%	5.07%	2.17%	1.86%	0.98%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	8.06%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	57
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	5

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
5	62	0.98%	8.06%	8.06%	N/A	N/A

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

Definition

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	65.00%	71.00%	79.00%	87.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	63.00%	71.00%	79.00%	87.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year’s performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI’s context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP’s instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year’s performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP’s instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	82	81	44
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	69	72	34
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	13	7	7

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	82	81	44
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	69	73	31
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	13	7	6

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	82	82	92.59%	80.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	79	81	85.07%	80.00%	97.53%	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	41	44	65.22%	65.00%	93.18%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	82	82	97.53%	80.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	80	81	92.54%	80.00%	98.77%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	37	44	63.04%	63.00%	84.09%	Met target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for

CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	69	72	34
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19	3	3

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	69	73	31
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	28	6	4

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	19	69	9.38%	9.00%	27.54%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3	72	8.00%	8.00%	4.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	3	34	4.76%	5.00%	8.82%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

A consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the PSS blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction of students, particularly in Group B. In an effort to improve instruction for our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	28	69	7.35%	7.00%	40.58%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6	73	5.45%	5.00%	8.22%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4	31	15.00%	15.00%	12.90%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

A consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the PSS blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction of students, particularly in Group C. In an effort to improve instruction for our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response**3B - Required Actions**

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	13	7	7
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	5	2	4

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	13	7	6
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	8	2	4

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5	13	27.27%	27.00%	38.46%	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	2	7	85.71%	85.00%	28.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	4	7	44.44%	44.00%	57.14%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

A consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the PSS blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction of students, particularly in Group B. In an effort to improve instruction for our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8	13	36.36%	36.00%	61.54%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2	7	85.71%	85.00%	28.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	4	6	55.56%	55.00%	66.67%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

A consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the PSS blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction of students, particularly in Group B. In an effort to improve instruction for our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	629	738	636
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	69	72	34
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	317	248	241
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10	2	1
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	19	3	3

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	630	738	614
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	69	73	31
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	323	291	375
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	17	3	4
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	28	6	4

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	27.54%	51.99%	35.66	36.00	24.45	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4.17%	33.88%	26.03	26.00	29.71	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.82%	38.05%	33.11	33.00	29.23	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction during this period may have contributed to the low proficiency rate, particularly with Group B. In an effort to improve instruction for our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	40.58%	53.97%	30.26	30.00	13.39	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.22%	39.84%	30.36	30.00	31.62	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	12.90%	61.73%	51.94	52.00	48.82	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction during this period may have contributed to the low proficiency rate, particularly with Group B. In an effort to improve instruction for our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2008	2.40%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

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

Using one year data lag, the reported data used for FFY 2021 Indicator 4A was from 2020-2021 as follows:

- Students without disabilities = 0% (0/8630)
- Students with disabilities = 0% (0/978) - consistent with the 618 discipline data submitted in November 2021
- Difference = 0%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to CNMI.

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	928
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	824
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	0
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	0
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	1

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

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	824	928	88.54%	85.00%	88.79%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13	928	1.67%	3.00%	1.40%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1	928	0.11%	0.70%	0.11%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	86.00%	43.04%
A	Data	85.87%	87.07%	78.70%	62.82%	43.04%
B	Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
B	Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	25	37	17	79
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	12	20	14	46
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	0	0	0
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	0	0	0
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	13	17	3	33

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

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	46	79	43.04%	43.00%	58.23%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	79	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	33	79	56.96%	57.00%	41.77%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2008	Target >=	93.50%	95.00%	96.50%	96.50%	93.00%
A1	96.00%	Data	75.00%	100.00%	89.47%	100.00%	93.75%

A2	2008	Target >=	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	57.00%	33.00%
A2	37.00%	Data	68.09%	39.02%	39.13%	51.43%	33.33%
B1	2008	Target >=	96.00%	98.00%	100.00%	100.00%	97.00%
B1	100.00%	Data	62.50%	97.44%	91.30%	96.97%	97.37%
B2	2008	Target >=	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%	31.00%	15.00%
B2	22.00%	Data	31.91%	19.51%	13.04%	25.71%	15.38%
C1	2008	Target >=	93.00%	95.00%	96.50%	96.50%	96.00%
C1	96.20%	Data	59.26%	100.00%	89.74%	100.00%	96.43%
C2	2008	Target >=	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%	72.50%	43.00%
C2	44.40%	Data	59.57%	41.46%	36.96%	57.14%	43.59%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

35

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	5.71%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	13	37.14%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	22.86%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	12	34.29%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	21	23	93.75%	93.00%	91.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	20	35	33.33%	33.00%	57.14%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.86%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	26	74.29%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	7	20.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.86%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	33	34	97.37%	97.00%	97.06%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	8	35	15.38%	15.00%	22.86%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	5.71%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12	34.29%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	17.14%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	15	42.86%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	18	20	96.43%	96.00%	90.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	21	35	43.59%	43.00%	60.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>In FFY 2021, CNMI did not meet 7A1 target of 93% by 1.70% with its performance of 91.30% (21/23). CNMI reported slippage by 2.45% from 93.75% (30/32) in FFY 2020 to 91.30% (21/23) in FFY 2021. By numbers both years reported two preschoolers with disabilities who exited the preschool program with improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning compared to same-aged peers (category b).</p> <p>In reviewing possible reasons for the slippage, the following data points were reviewed for the two preschoolers who were in category b: Age of entry, Length of service, and Disability. Between the two, there was a difference in age of entry – one was at 3 years of age and one at 4 years old, which impacted the length of services by the time they exited. Both preschoolers were identified under the same disability category and required related services to support their special education program. These data points indicate that these preschoolers received additional support and services throughout their preschool program and continue to receive special education and related services in school. A factor for one preschooler could have been the length of service which was just over a year of preschool services.</p> <p>Another consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the social-emotional development of the two preschoolers identified under category b.</p> <p>With preschool services back to face-to-face instruction, the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teachers and staff continue to implement developmentally appropriate practices for the development of positive social emotional skills in preschoolers with disabilities.</p>
C1	<p>In FFY 2021, CNMI did not meet 7C1 target of 96% by 6% with its performance of 90% (18/20). CNMI reported slippage by 6.43% from 96.43% (27/28) in FFY 2020 to 90% (18/20) in FFY 2021. By numbers there was one preschooler in FFY 2020 compared to two preschoolers in FFY 2021 who exited the preschool program with improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning compared to same-aged peers (category b).</p> <p>In reviewing possible reasons for the slippage, the following data points were reviewed for the two preschoolers who were in category b: Age of entry, Length of service, and Disability. It should be noted that there are similar characteristics in the data points for the two preschoolers in category b for this Outcome 7C1 as with the two preschoolers in category b for Outcome 7A1.</p> <p>The age of entry showed one preschooler entered at 3 years of age and the other at 4 years old, which impacted the length of services by the time they exited. Both preschoolers were identified under the same disability category and required related services to support their special education program. These data points indicate that these preschoolers received additional support and services throughout their preschool program and continue to receive special education and related services in school. A factor for one preschooler could have been the length of service which was just over a year of preschool services. This one preschooler was also reported under category b for</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>7A1.</p> <p>Another consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the PSS blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the appropriate behaviors development of the two preschoolers identified under category b.</p> <p>With preschool services back to face-to-face instruction, the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teachers and staff continue to implement developmentally appropriate practices for the development of behavioral/self-help skills in preschoolers with disabilities.</p>

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

Data sources include:

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	78.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020

Target >=	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Data	91.34%	92.31%	93.53%		92.11%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
437	471	92.11%	90.00%	92.78%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

For preschoolers with disabilities, 103 surveys were disseminated; of which, 60 completed surveys were returned, representing 58.25% (60/103) parents of preschoolers with disabilities. For school-age students with disabilities, 887 surveys were disseminated, with 411 completed surveys returned for a 46.34% (411/887) response rate.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

990

Percentage of respondent parents

47.58%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	15.00%	47.58%

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

In FFY 2021, CNMI reported an increase in response rate by 32.58% from 15% (152/1013) in FFY 2020 to 47.58% (471/990). This increase could be attributed to the dissemination method changing from an online survey, with paper surveys available, in FFY 2020 to paper surveys disseminated through the preschool programs and schools in FFY 2021.

To continue to increase the response rate, CNMI will work closely with the PSS Parent Advisory Council (PAC) comprised of Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) presidents of elementary, middle, and high schools whose purpose is to present issues and concerns from their respective PTSA councils to the PSS Leadership, and for PSS Leadership to share information to the PAC for dissemination to PTSAs. With CNMI programs and schools back to in-person instruction, dissemination of information will include both in-person and virtual methods to ensure we are able to reach parents to encourage them to complete the survey, in particular on Saipan, the largest of the three CNMI island communities.

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

In FFY 2021, CNMI reported an increase in response rate by 32.58% from 15% (152/1013) in FFY 2020 to 47.58% (471/990). This increase was represented in both age-groups – preschool and school-age. For preschool, the response rate increased from 14.71% (15/102) in FFY 2020 to 58.25% (60/103). For school-age, the response rate increased from 18.11% (165/911) in FFY 2020 to 46.34% (411/887).

The analysis of the response rate included a review of responses by the preschool service locations and schools. For preschool, the response rate was 58.25% (60/103), representing all preschool service locations in the three CNMI islands. The representation by islands included 100% response rate for Rota and Tinian, the two smaller island communities, and over 50% response rate in Saipan.

For school-age, the overall response rate was 46.34% (411/887), representing all schools in the three CNMI island communities. Representation by islands included 88.46% (46/52) in Rota, 93.94% (31/33) in Tinian, and 39.53% (334/845) in Saipan. Further analysis of the Saipan schools included a review of response rates by school-levels: Elementary = 49.40% (164/332), Middle = 42.24% (98/232), and High School = 30.25% (72/238).

The analysis of the respondents indicated a cross section of parents did respond. All islands were represented, with the majority of surveys received from the island of Saipan, the largest of the three CNMI islands. All 20 CNMI schools were represented in the number of surveys collected. With this year's paper survey dissemination, the process included reminders to parents via email and calls by the preschool program and school personnel to encourage all parents to respond.

As described in the representativeness section, the demographics of ethnicity and location of respondents were determined not to be representative of children with disabilities receiving special education services. However, to determine the potential nonresponse bias, CNMI analyzed the location of respondents and process for dissemination at each level - preschool locations and schools.

As discussed in the Strategies section above, to continue to increase the response rate, CNMI will work closely with the PSS Parent Advisory Council (PAC) comprised of Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA) presidents of elementary, middle, and high schools whose purpose is to present issues and concerns from their respective PTSA councils to the PSS Leadership, and for PSS Leadership to share information to the PAC for dissemination to PTSAs. With CNMI programs and schools back to in-person instruction, dissemination of information will include both in-person and virtual methods to ensure we are able to reach parents to encourage them to complete the survey, in particular on Saipan, the largest of the three CNMI island communities.

Based on CNMI's analysis of the response rate, CNMI did not identify nonresponse bias in the FFY 2021 response rate. As described earlier, all preschool locations and schools were represented as respondents and the process for dissemination included distribution of paper surveys with reminders via email and calls.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

To determine representativeness of the surveys collected, CNMI analyzed the ethnicity and geographic location demographics of the respondents compared to the same demographics of CNMI's Child Count - students with an IEP at the time the surveys were disseminated.

The parent survey included ethnicity and geographic location for parents to respond to. The ethnicity item asked parents to indicate their child's ethnicity by checking one of the listed OSEP ethnicity categories. The geographic location item on the survey asked parents to indicate their child's center (preschool) or school.

Based on the +/-3 discrepancy calculation, the Asian and "Two or More" ethnicity categories reported over-representation for the Asian category at 7.74% and under-representation for the "Two or More" category at -5.41%. The White/Caucasian and Other Pacific Islander ethnicity categories were within the +/-3 difference. All ethnicity categories reported in CNMI's Child Count data were represented in the survey respondents. A consideration in reviewing the over and under representation is that parents were asked to identify their child's ethnicity. This process required the parents to self-identify with an ethnic group. The selection of "Two or More" might not have been understood by parents, which could be the reason for that category reporting under-representation, while the Asian category reported over-representation.

The second demographic reviewed for representativeness was geographic location or the three island communities of the CNMI. Based on the +/-3 discrepancy calculation, all three island communities did not show representativeness with the differences exceeding +/-3: Saipan at -8.76%, Tinian at 3.92%, and Rota at 4.85%. Although all islands, programs, and schools were represented in the respondent group, the discrepancy calculation showed that Saipan was under-represented, while Tinian and Rota were over-represented.

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

NO

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

With the significant increase in response rate through the paper survey dissemination compared to last year's online survey, CNMI will continue with the paper survey dissemination and will work with the various parent groups, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), and the PSS PAC to support this dissemination efforts to promote increased responses from parents of children with disabilities. In addition, the dissemination process will include awareness activities with parents about the survey items to ensure responses reflect accurate demographics.

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

The metric used to determine representativeness in the FFY 2021 parent survey response was the +/-3% discrepancy calculation. The target group for the calculation was the Child Count as of the dissemination period. CNMI uses a census dissemination process that included all students with an IEP at the time the survey was disseminated to parents of preschoolers and school-age children with disabilities.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, CNMI must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions CNMI is taking to address this issue. CNMI must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

CNMI reported the required representativeness analysis and discussion in the Indicator 8 Data section of this FFY 2021 APR.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, CNMI must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions CNMI is taking to address this issue. CNMI must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to CNMI.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to CNMI.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	53.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.96%	99.11%	96.53%	94.16%	92.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
196	168	92.00%	100%	85.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

CNMI reported slippage by 6.29% from 92% (161/175) in FFY 2020 to 85.71% (168/196) in FFY 2021. The reasons for the slippage were due to nonadherence to procedures and shortage of evaluators. A contributing factor to this nonadherence to procedures could be that schools continued a "blended" learning model, a combination of face-to-face and online learning. Due to the increase in COVID-19 cases, PSS schools transitioned to remote learning in November 2021 through December 2021. Schools re-opened for face-to-face instruction in January 2022. This shift in the number of days that students were on campus required a coordinated scheduling effort by all evaluators. In addition, CNMI experienced a shortage of evaluators to complete the required assessments in FFY 2021.

To address the nonadherence to procedures, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Also, to address the shortage of evaluators, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program has on board two on-island evaluators and has contracted with two off-island evaluators to conduct on-site evaluations throughout the year.

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

28

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

The 28 initial evaluations accounted for under (a) but not included in (b) were from six elementary schools (KES, OES, SE, SVE, TE, WSR), one middle school (HMS), two high schools (TJSH and SSHS), and one private school. All 28 initial evaluations were completed, with 26 not eligible for special education services. The days beyond the 60-day timeline included:

= 2 days to 93 days over timeline = 20 initial evaluations

= 101 days to 162 days over timeline = 6 initial evaluations

= 249 & 276 days over timeline = 2 initial evaluations (NOTE: This was attributed to the shortage of evaluators)

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The data for this indicator is taken from the database of all children for whom a consent for initial evaluation was received for the report period of July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022. The Data Manager logs the referral information into the database which generates the time requirements (60 days from receipt of the parent consent). The Data Manager sends out the referral information to the schools and providers responsible for the evaluation. Upon completion of evaluations, the reports are sent to the data manager to input into the database. The database is formatted to "flag" any date over the 60-day timeline. For all red flags, a Reason for Delay form is required. The Data Manager, in consultation with the Special Education Director and Compliance Monitor, designates a determination of valid or invalid reasons for delay, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(d).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14		0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The FFY 2020 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected through a review of updated data of actual initial evaluation documents from the six schools and one independent evaluator responsible for the one private school. These schools/independent evaluator received the Written Notice of Findings for the 14 individual instances of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2020 Indicator 11 performance data of 92% (161/175). As described in the FFY 2020 for Indicator 11, the 14 individual instances of noncompliance were completed over timeline. To verify correction, updated data of actual initial evaluation documents were submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the State data system.

In FFY 2021, the review of the actual initial evaluation documents from the six schools resulted in the six schools determined to have verified timely correction of the initial evaluation regulatory requirement with the updated data demonstrating 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement within the one-year timeframe for verified correction. These additional initial evaluations from the six schools demonstrating 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement confirmed that these schools were correctly implementing the 60-day initial evaluation regulatory requirement, resulting in the six schools receiving a Written Notice of Timely Correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Initial evaluations for private schools are conducted by independent evaluators through individual contracts with the PSS. The contracts stipulate the

requirement for meeting the 60-day timeline for completing initial evaluations. The independent evaluator responsible for completing the initial evaluation for the one private school was issued a Written Notice of Findings and put on notice of the requirement for verified correction of subsequent initial evaluations at 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline. In FFY 2021, the review of actual initial evaluation documents from the independent evaluator demonstrated 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement within the one-year timeframe for verified correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

As documented in the FFY 2020 performance data for Indicator 11, the 14 initial evaluations from six schools and one private school were not completed in a timely manner. These schools and the one independent evaluator responsible for private schools were issued a Written Notice of Findings because the initial evaluations were not completed within the 60-day timeline. Although late, all instances of noncompliance were verified to be completed through a review of actual initial evaluation documents submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, as reported in FFY 2020 for Indicator 11. In addition, through a review of updated data of actual initial evaluations submitted to the PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the six schools and the one independent evaluator for the private schools demonstrated 100% compliance with the updated data of initial evaluations demonstrating 100% verified timely correction and received a Written Notice of Timely Correction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because CNMI reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, CNMI must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, CNMI must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified correction of the noncompliance it identified in FFY 2020 under this indicator. CNMI must confirm that it: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within its jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, CNMI must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If CNMI did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why CNMI did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

As described in the Indicator 11 Data section, CNMI reported verified correction of the findings of noncompliance identified from the FFY 2020 Indicator 11 performance of 92% (161/175), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. CNMI provided a description of how CNMI verified correction of the individual instances of noncompliance and the updated/subsequent data related to the 60-day timeline requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because CNMI reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, CNMI must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, CNMI must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator, and: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within CNMI's jurisdiction, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, CNMI must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If CNMI did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why CNMI did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	96.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	45
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	1

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	34
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	10
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	34	34	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	77.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.18%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
199	199	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2009	Target >=	18.00%	19.00%	20.00%	20.00%	17.00%
A	10.00%	Data	10.17%	12.24%	16.13%	8.62%	17.02%
B	2009	Target >=	58.00%	61.00%	63.00%	63.00%	40.00%
B	62.00%	Data	61.02%	48.98%	72.58%	56.90%	40.43%
C	2009	Target >=	75.00%	81.00%	87.00%	87.00%	40.00%
C	86.00%	Data	64.41%	61.22%	75.81%	63.79%	40.43%

FFY 2020 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year’s performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI’s context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP’s instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year’s performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for

CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	62
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	57
Response Rate	91.94%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	7
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	25
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	8
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	7	57	17.02%	17.00%	12.28%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	32	57	40.43%	40.00%	56.14%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	40	57	40.43%	45.00%	70.18%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Students that were surveyed opted for competitive employment versus higher education during this reporting period due to the continuation of remote or virtual learning as the only option available at the time.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	70.15%	91.94%

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

CNMI reported an increase in response rate by 21.79% from 70.15% (47/67) in FFY 2020 to 91.94% (57/62) in FFY 2021. The CNMI PSS will continue to utilize the Post-School Outcome survey to collect and report data for this indicator. Each school year special education teachers notify students as well as parents or guardians that the student will be contacted for a post school interview one year from leaving high school to see if they have met their goals. During the school year, special education teachers ensure that contact information is updated and current prior to the student exiting.

Beginning spring of each year, school teams contact the exiters or their families (possibly siblings, relatives, etc.) to conduct the post-school survey. Surveys are gathered and submitted to the Data and Compliance Program Manager for review to ensure all sections have been completed correctly and accounted for all exiters.

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

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

In FFY 2021, CNMI's response rate of 91.94% (57/62) represented the broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. The analysis of the response rate did not identify any nonresponse bias. The analysis included a review of the characteristics of the target group (all leavers) compared to the respondent group and the characteristics of the respondent group compared to the nonrespondent group. As reported below, the demographic categories of the respondent group were representative of the target group, all leavers. In comparing the demographics of the nonrespondent group to the respondent group, there were no difference in the characteristics between the two groups. The geographic location, exit, ethnicity, and disability characteristics of the nonrespondent group were represented in the respondent group.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

CNMI's FFY 2021 response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. CNMI used the NPSO Response Calculator to calculate the response data by demographic categories for the target group compared to the respondent group.

The NPSO Response Calculator identifies whether the discrepancy between the target group and respondent group exceeded +/-3%, in particular in the geographic location, exit, ethnicity, and disability categories. Exceeding a +/-3% difference between the two groups indicates over or under representation, which would mean that the response data are not representative of the target group.

All demographic categories reviewed did not exceed the +/-3% difference, which meant that the response data are representative of the target group. The differences by demographic categories included:

Geographic location: This category reviewed the target and respondent groups from the three CNMI islands: Saipan, Rota, and Tinian. The difference was -0.57% for Saipan, 0.14% for Rota, and 0.42% for Tinian.

Exit: The two exit categories of all leavers for Indicator 14 were Drop-Out and Graduation with a High School Diploma (HSD). The difference calculated was -1.04% for Drop-Out and 1.04% for Graduation with a HSD.

Ethnicity: Three ethnicity categories represented the target group: Asian, Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More. All three ethnicity categories were represented in the respondent group. The difference calculated was -0.61 for Asian, -0.88 for Other Pacific Islander, and 1.27 for Two or More.

Disability: Eight disability categories represented the target group: SLD, ID, OHI, ED, HI, AUT, MD, and SLI. All eight disability categories were represented in the respondent group, with a range of difference from -1.19% for MD to 1.14% for OHI.

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

YES

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

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

CNMI used the NPSO Response Calculator to determine representativeness. The NPSO Response Calculator calculates the response data by demographic categories and determines representativeness of the target group (all leavers). The NPSO Response Calculator utilizes a discrepancy measure of exceeding a +/- 3% difference in the proportion of responders compared to the target group.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=					

Data					
------	--	--	--	--	--

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=					

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

CNMI reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=					

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

CNMI reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

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

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	26.92%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

# of 3rd Graders with an IEP in the Three Target Schools who scored At or Above Proficient in Reading	# of 3rd Graders with an IEP in the Three Target Schools with Valid Scores in Reading	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4	31	26.92%	27.00%	12.90%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

CNMI did not meet its Indicator 17 target and reported slippage by 14.02% from 26.92% (7/26) in FFY 2020 to 12.90% (4/31) in FFY 2021. By numbers, the percentages represented seven 3rd graders with an IEP in FFY 2020 and four 3rd graders with an IEP in FFY 2021 who scored at the proficient level in the three target schools, with an increase in the overall 3rd graders with an IEP in the target schools from 26 in FFY 2020 to 31 in FFY 2021.

As noted in Indicators 3B and 3C, a consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022

continued the PSS blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction of students. In an effort to improve instruction for our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

For SY21-22, the CNMI Public School System (PSS) Renaissance STAR Reading (k-3) assessment proficiency data from the end of the year outcomes and the multi-state alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

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

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

The data collected included the 3rd grade IEP students with valid scores in the three SSIP target schools. The numerator of "4" represented those 3rd grade IEP students with a valid score in the three SSIP target schools who scored at the proficient level in reading as measured by the Renaissance STAR Reading and AA-AAS. The denominator of "31" represented the total number of 3rd grade IEP students with a valid score in the three target schools.

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

YES

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

The PSS conducts three benchmark screenings annually. For this reporting period, the Fall screening was conducted from September 19 - October 07, 2022. The Spring screening was scheduled for January 23 - February 03, 2023. Outcome data from SY 2021-2022, conducted April 24 - May 06, 2022 was used to show proficiency trends compared to this school year's data. The benchmark screening data are used to determine the type and intensity of intervention to be provided.

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

https://www.cnmipss.org/sites/default/files/cnmissipevaluationplanworksheet_508_compliant_0.pdf

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

NO

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

STRAND: Governance and Leadership

A. Strategy: Universal Screening

The PSS continues to implement the universal screening and the use of the results as secondary data. The outcomes for this strategy were measured by conducting four screenings and a fidelity checklist. For SY21-22, the PSS adopted the Renaissance STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading as the source for the outcome data at the end of the school year by using Screening #4 data. The implementation of the universal screening has scaled-up to the remaining elementary schools. However, due to COVID-19, Screening #2 for SY21-22 was canceled as students were placed in remote learning. For this reporting period, the fidelity checklists were collected from randomly selected teachers from the scale-up schools.

B. Strategy: Implementation of the Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum

For this reporting period, the PSS continued to implement Journeys as its Early Literacy and Reading curriculum with the core instruction focusing on the foundations of reading. However, during this reporting period, the PSS explored the possibility of selecting another evidence-based core curriculum to address the issue of blended learning (i.e., face to face and virtual instruction).

C. Strategy: Early Warning Systems (EWS) for Grades Kinder through 3rd

This strategy addresses the identification of students exhibiting academic and behavior-at-risk performance who are in need of supplemental interventions to improve academic performance.

D. Strategy: High Dosage Tutoring

High Dosage Tutoring (HDT) addresses the academic needs of students requiring Tier 2 and 3 academic intervention(s).

E. Strategy: Establishment of a Family Engagement and Community Involvement Program

The goal of this strategy is to increase the performance of students in the PSS through better engagement of families and the community in the education of students in the CNMI Public school through the provision of professional learning opportunities.

Strand: Professional Development

A. Strategy: Early Warning Systems (EWS) for Grades K-3

Two Data Team Meetings were conducted by two of the early adopters schools. Participants included their K-3 school teams and the district EWS Team

B. Strategy: Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)

In August 2022, the district provided a Training of Trainers workshop for all Elementary school teams on the SEL Program: Positive Action. Positive Action School level professional development was conducted for all K-5th grade teachers with a 100% participation rate.

C. Strategy: ELL Program/ELL Teachers

In August 2022, ELL Teachers were provided with ELL and SIOP Training facilitated by Pearson. WIDA assessment training was conducted October through December 2022 for ELL teachers and school level teachers. ELL teachers hold monthly meetings to address any ELL topics, programs, documents, data and other miscellaneous items.

D. Strategy: High Dosage Tutoring

Two training sessions were held in August and October for all high dosage tutors and peer tutors.

E. Strategy: Development, Review, and Implementation of the IEP.

Four professional development sessions were conducted during this reporting period.

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

STRAND: Governance and Leadership

1a. Strategy: Universal Screening

The intermediate outcome includes the participation and proficiency data for all students and disaggregated for students with an IEP in grades K-3rd grade. For this reporting period, screening #3 and #4 for the SY21-22. Screening #4 was used as the outcome data for SY21-22. Benchmark data for SY22-23 is limited to the Fall'22 screening as the Winter screening will not be available until after the submission of this report.

Participation (K-3rd)

	# Of ALL Students/Students with IEP	# of ALL Students Screened/Students with IEP * Participation Rate (ALL)/Students w/IEP*
Screening #3 (Winter'22)	1058/95	997*/76* 94%/80%
Screening #4 (Outcome - SPR'22)	1039/104 1007*/89*	97%/86%
Screening #1 (Fall'22)	980/98 944*/84*	96%/86%

*The # of students screened includes K-3rd grade students that were screened with STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, or alternate screening assessment.

Proficiency Rate

Performance Level # of All Students/Students w/IEP % of All Students/Students with an IEP

Screening #3 (Winter'22)

At or above Benchmark **404/**5 41%/7%

Screening #4 (Outcome-SPR'22)

At or above Benchmark **496/**9 49%/10%

Screening #1 (Fall'22)

At or above Benchmark **329/**7 35%/8%

1b. STAR Early Literacy/Reading Fidelity Data

The collection of fidelity data for the implementation of the STAR universal screening was conducted in 8 of the 9 elementary schools by either the principal or assistant principal. The checklist addressed the tasks "Before Testing", "During Testing", and "After Testing." Each observer was asked to rate the tasks under each task as "clearly evident", "somewhat evident", or "not observed." "Before Testing" included 7 items and a rating of "Clearly Evident" ranged from 78.3% to 97.8% with the highest percentage related to the task of scheduling the testing and the lowest involving printing the student log in materials, reviewing and pretest instructions. The "During Testing" consisted of 6 items and a rating of "Clearly evident" ranged from 51.2% to 97.8%. The task achieving the highest was one in which the teacher walked around the room to monitor the students during administration while the task with the lowest was one in which teachers were observed administering the math prior to the reading subtest. The "After Testing" tasks consisted of 3 items. The range of ratings as "Clearly Evident" was from 45.7% to 54.3%. The task with the highest rating of "clearly evident" involved the printing and/or review of the student reports on the STAR dashboard. Please note that a task may not have obtained a rating of "clearly evident" if the task was not required at the time of the observation.

*The # of students screened includes K-3rd grade students that were screened with STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, or alternate screening assessment.

Strategy: Implementation of the Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum

For this reporting period, the PSS continued to implement Journeys as its Early Literacy and Reading curriculum with the core instruction focusing on the foundations of reading. However, during this reporting period, the PSS explored the possibility of selecting another evidence-based core curriculum to address the issue of blended learning (i.e., face to face and virtual instruction).

Strategy: Early Warning Systems (EWS) for Grades Kinder through 3rd

The EWS identified 65.7% 6 of K-3 students that are at Urgent Intervention in Star Reading and Early Literacy at the EWS schools. At this time, the data is limited to the number of students who are "flagged" and not the number of students receiving an intervention. As of this reporting period, 5/9 or 56% of elementary schools are actively utilizing the EWS processes and tools. The remaining schools are still adapting the tools and processes for their school but are not fully implementing them at this time.

In a survey from 9 school teams implementing the EWS, 62.5 % (5 out of 8)reported that they are importing correct and complete student data into the EWS data collection tool while 55.6% (5/9) are using the EWS tool to assign students to interventions in a systematic manner (tracking of interventions).

Strategy: High Dosage Tutoring

The enrollment for the nine elementary schools is 2222 of which 237 or 10.7% are receiving high dosage tutoring services.

Strategy: Family Engagement & Community Involvement

The following activities were implemented as strategies for improving the achievement of all students.

The PTSA had proposed that \$5000 be allocated to each school each year to conduct parent trainings as well as to increase parent engagement and involvement in each of the schools that will result in increased academic performances. During this reporting period, a total of 19 schools had submitted proposals that were approved and plans completed by the end of August 2022.

The PSS conducted its annual Parent Summit in November 2022 with 155 participants with a response rate of 57%. The evaluations indicated that a majority of the participants indicated the content, the ideas, and the impact were very appropriate and useful. In addition, the majority also indicated the workshop met their expectations and that it was well structured.

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

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

NO

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

Governance and Leadership:

Early Warning System (EWS): Develop district wide procedures for systematic implementation of the EWS. Provide initial and follow-up training for all participants and monitor implementation.

High-Dosage Tutoring: Train school personnel in tracking progress of students receiving high-dosage tutoring and its impact on reading.

Family Engagement & Community Involvement:

Provide training and coaching to SSIP target schools (small scale) on Institute of Education Sciences (IES) REL Southeast Teacher's Guide in Supporting Families in Foundational Reading Skills.

Professional Development:

Collect data on implementation of changes in school personnel behaviors as a result of professional development that is beyond the initial reactions(after event evaluation) to the training.

Accountability/Monitoring System

Monitor the implementation of the activities identified in each of the school's School Wide Plans (SWPs) related to the provision of resources for subgroups.

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

1. Universal Screening: Renaissance STAR Reading
2. Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum - Journeys
3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3
4. High-dosage Tutoring
5. School-based training in the Foundations of Reading
6. English Language Learners (ELL) Coaching
7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
8. Data-based decision making
9. Classroom observations -monitoring the fidelity in implementation of evidence-based instructional programs
10. Social and Emotional Learning- Positive Action

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

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

10. Social and Emotional Learning- Positive Action: Implemented in all elementary schools to address and promote healthy and positive mental health for students to learn.

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

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

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

1. Governance/Leadership
 - a. Universal Screening
 - Screenings are conducted three times a year. Fidelity checks are conducted during each screening period.
 - b. Implementation of Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum
 - There are two forms of data collected by the Office of Curriculum & Instruction and school level administrators. Fidelity data is collected on the Journeys curriculum. In addition, data is collected on the delivery of core instruction in the foundations of reading. Data is collected at least once a year.
 - c. Early Warning System (EWS)
 - The impact of the implementation of the EWS will be measured by the number of students identified as needing supplemental support and the effectiveness of the interventions to improve instruction.
 - d. High Dosage Tutoring
 - Program evaluation surveys are conducted at the end of each year and the results are used to address areas for strength and areas for growth.
 - Surveys are collected from tutors, teachers, and students.
2. Professional Development
 - All professional development activities are initially evaluated with a "Reaction Survey" at the end of each activity and observations to collect data on change in practices.
3. Collaborative Efforts
 - Professional Learning Community
 - Data on participation and data discussion of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are collected monthly.
 - Family Supports/Family Partnerships
 - Data will be collected on participation of families in activities to improve student achievement as well as reaction surveys.
 - Collect parent demographics data of parents that attend parent summits, trainings, meetings.
4. Accountability System
 - School Wide Plans (SWPs) are reviewed annually and if approved, activities are funded for implementation. SWPs are evaluated to determine if the plan addresses the academic needs of subgroups such as students with an IEP. With this requirement, the schools are held accountable for all students.
5. Monitoring System
 - The Office of Curriculum & Instruction And school level administrators continue to monitor the fidelity of implementing the Journeys curriculum and the delivery of the Foundations of Reading as described in the section on Governance/Leadership.

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

* Continuation of data from Section A and B

STRAND: Professional Development

A. Strategy: Development, Revision, and Implementation of the IEP

Two activities were conducted during this reporting period for this strategy: (1) Root Cause analysis (2) Progress Center Training.

1. Root Cause Analysis:

April/May 2022: The three SSIP target schools conducted a root cause analysis using the 5-Whys. It resulted in identifying a possible solution on why students with IEPs are not meeting benchmarks. The three groups identified the following possible solutions: (1) Matching the specially designed instruction with the student's needs and (2) Allocation of additional time for the teaching of basic foundational reading skills.

2. The second activity consisted of four professional development sessions from the Progress Center. Three of the four sessions were conducted virtually while the fourth session was conducted in person. The first two sessions focused on the "Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)" while the third session focused on using the PLAAFP to develop annual goals. The fourth session focused on the specially designed instruction (SDI), related services, and supplementary aids and services. The sessions were attended by general and special educators, administrators, teacher aides, and related service personnel. Prior to the virtual sessions, participants were requested to complete the related modules from the Progress Center. The feedback on the first three sessions indicated that a majority of the participants indicated that the content was either a review, a reinforcement of what they already knew, or increased their understanding of the content. Ninety percent (90%) of the participants indicated the activities were relevant and over 86% found them useful. Over 98% either agreed or strongly agreed that the sessions increased their awareness of the IEP and the resources from the Progress Center.

For the session conducted in December 2022, a retro evaluation format was utilized. Respondents were asked to rate their knowledge level before and after the training session. For each component of the training, the percent of participants that rated themselves as having a "high" knowledge of the content increased after the training. Additional feedback included the relevancy, usefulness, and satisfaction with the face-to-face session: 100% indicated the session was relevant and useful while 88% and 8.8% respectively were either very satisfied or satisfied.

Please note that participants were not limited to elementary schools.

3. October 31, 2022 - IEP Task Force Creation

The IEP task force is comprised of seven (7) special education teachers ranging from 3-25 years of teaching experience: 3 elementary school teachers, 2 middle school teachers, 2 high school teachers. The purpose of this IEP task force is to be the conduit to their school-level colleagues and the SEA to help build the confidence of our Special Education teachers in writing & implementing IEPs, and conducting IEP meetings, through partnership with our regional TA provider, Guam CEDDERS and national TA provider, The Progress Center. The program outcomes include sustained implementation of this initiative by creating special education mentors from the task force members once the TA support has been exhausted. The task force is led by an Instructional Coach, under the supervision of the Special Education Director. The IEP task force has had eight (8) work sessions since November 2, 2022, and helped facilitate one training session for the special education teachers on December 17, 2022.

B. Training for ELL teachers

The Literacy Coaches were converted to English Language Learner (ELL) coaches/teachers. To support the ELL coaches/teachers ongoing, job-embedded training is provided through the monthly meetings. In addition, and ELL and SIOP training was held from August 8-12, 2022, WIDA assessment training held from October - December 2022, and a WIDA PD conference held in Sept.28-29, 2022.

C. Early Warning Systems (EWS)

Two training sessions were held during this reporting period: February 24, and March 7, 2022. These sessions focused on understanding and building proficiency in the use of data. The audience included all K-3 Elementary school data teams and the district EWS team.

Strand: Collaborative Efforts

SY 22-23 Elementary PLC Collaboration Observation - The purpose of the observation is to evaluate the extent collaboration occurs at the school level between general education and teachers from special programs (Special Education, Title I, EL Teacher). The results are as follows: There were a total of 107 responses related to the PLC collaborative efforts. Of the 107 responses, 61% were obtained from principals and 39% were from assistant principals. The observations indicated that 100% of the PLCs had an agenda and the agenda/task included a discussion of at-risk students (i.e., English Language Learners (ELLs), students with an IEP, etc.). Ninety-three percent (93%) reported level 4 for level of engagement which is equivalent to most to all participating as a collaborative team member. In addition, 86% of the responders indicated that the collaborative teams discussed early literacy/reading to guide instructional planning, but 100% also reported that other sources of data were also discussed.

Strand: Accountability System

School Wide Plans (SWPs): 9 schools - 56% include resources for K-3 literacy in their SWPs.

Strand: Monitoring System

The PSS collected fidelity data on the implementation of Journeys (early literacy/reading curriculum) and the foundations of reading. Observations were conducted in grades K-3 from eight (8) of the nine (9) elementary schools. The checklist included the following: Classroom Environment: 82% had focus walls, 98% had established areas for whole groups, small groups, and centers. Only 73% of the observations indicated that student materials were utilized during instruction such as student textbooks, student handbook, etc; Opening Routines: 78% of the classroom included opening routines; 78% of the observations indicated that vocabulary was part of the instructional routine.

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

1. Universal Screening:

-Collect fidelity data from the scale-up schools with the anticipated outcome that teachers are implementing the screening tool appropriately.

2. Evidence-based Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum:

-In SY 2023-2024, implementation of the new Reading curriculum: Into Reading. Professional development alignment planning, professional development for teachers will be provided and a new fidelity checklist will be implemented and used for monitoring.

3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3

-Increase the number of schools participating in the EWS system with the outcome to timely identification of students and delivery of needed supplemental interventions.

-Track the interventions being provided to students identified through EWS.

4. High Dosage Tutoring

- Increase the capacity of each elementary school to provide High Dosage Tutoring to students in need of it with the outcome of improved achievement.
- Collect HDT data on effectiveness of the program

5. Professional Development

- Expand the training in the foundations of reading to the scale-up schools and collect fidelity checks with the outcome of improved student reading skills
- Training on the new reading curriculum for all schools
- Conduct observations of the delivery of the specially designed instruction (SDI-i.e., special education).
- Revise the IEP forms to more closely align with the language of the IDEA regulations.
- Provide professional development in the delivery of SDI that matches the student's unique needs.

6. English Language Learners (ELL) Coaching

- Provide each ELL Teacher with instruction materials and professional development in assessment, documentation and providing services to students

7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)

- Collect PLC data on participation of general education and special education in PLC sessions with discussions that include performance of students with an IEP. Outcome is improved achievement for all students, but specifically for students with an IEP.

8. Data-based decision making

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

9. Classroom observations -monitoring the fidelity in implementation of evidence-based instructional programs

- Collect baseline fidelity data on the implementation of the reading curriculum in the scale-up schools with the outcome that teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity.

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

YES

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

PSS will continue to implement and monitor the infrastructure activities to determine the effectiveness of the current strategies and practices in place.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

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

- Conduct annual Parent Summit
- Gather input data from special education teachers
- Continue input sessions with advisory panel members

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

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Chief State School Officer

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

Name:

Alfred B. Ada, Ed.D

Title:

Commissioner of Education

Email:

alfred.ada@cnmipss.org

Phone:

6702373061

Submitted on:

04/23/23 9:34:41 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
84.00%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	8	6	75.00%
Compliance	10	9	90.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	85%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	86%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	N/A	N/A

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years	7	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years**	92	2

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	85.71%	YES	1
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	100.00%	N/A	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	N/A		N/A
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR³

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	N/A	0
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	N/A	0
10	N/A	0
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	18
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	23

³ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

		618 Data ⁴		
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	21
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

⁴ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	23
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	49.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	3
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	49.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

***Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>