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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

This Executive Summary includes a description of CNMI’s IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2019. A description of the CNMI’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System and Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR and how the CNMI will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of CNMI’s FFY 2019 APR.   
  
In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP) provided input on additional targets for the Results Indicators for FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. Per OSEP’s instructions, SPP Indicators 3A, 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR.   
  
Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted school operations with schools closing on March 16, 2020 for the remainder of school year 2019-2020. In addition, CNMI's austerity measures due to the economic impact of the recent super typhoon natural disaster compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic also impacted school operations. The impact on CNMI's data collection and reporting is reflected in the related indicators, which include the following:  
  
-Personnel having to adjust to administering tests virtually.  
-CNMI’s austerity limited the availability of furloughed general education teachers who had information about the concerns regarding the students prior to schools closing. General education teachers were furloughed from April 1, 2020 – August 26, 2020.  
-CNMI PSS implemented a 4-day work/school week, which limited access to general education personnel.  
-CNMI PSS implemented distance learning with limited face-to-face interventions beginning the new school year 2020-2021.   
-CNMI PSS implemented an online school registration system, which resulted in issues for students transitioning or transferring to another school at the beginning of school year 2020-2021.

**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 schools aligned to the school needs. Over past few years, the PSS has implemented several system wide initiatives intended to improve results for all students. PSS also accesses and benefits from universal technical assistance provided by OSEP and OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources, either through publications, guidance tools, resource materials, monthly conference calls and webinars, or in person on site assistance through Pacific Learning Collaboratives or other venues. TA Centers such as NCSI for work on the SIMR, IDEA Data Center for evaluating the SSIP plans and high quality data use, the DaSy Center and ECTA for the collection and analysis of the Early Intervention and Special Education preschool outcomes data. PSS also contracts with the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research and Service (Guam CEDDERS) for targeted 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 students with disabilities.**

The CNMI PSS has in place a system of professional development (PD) to ensure that service providers, teachers and school level personnel have the knowledge and skills needed to improve the results of all students including students with disabilities. All PSS school level staff are required to maintain 60 PD hours per contract year and to participate in 10 PD events during the school year. Two (2) of the 10 days are designated PD specific to PSS wide initiatives and 8 days are specific to school level needs.   
  
In school year 2019-2020, the office of Student Support Services and the office of Curriculum and Instruction engaged in several focus areas for improvement and included a focus on PD:   
• The Office of Curriculum and Instruction selected a new Language Arts curriculum for KG to 6th grades. PD continues to be provided to all elementary schools on the reading curriculum and the essential components of reading.   
• Reading and Literacy Coaching is now implemented in all elementary schools. The “Literacy” coaches were provided PD and mentoring on coaching methodologies and strategies.   
• A universal screening has been implemented in all KG to 3rd grade. All teachers, Literacy Coaches and Title I teachers were provided PD on the implementation of the screening procedures with fidelity to ensure the screening data are valid and reliable. The training included data collection and use to make instructional based decisions. The special education program continues to provide ongoing PD on the evaluation and IEP processes, procedural safeguards, transition requirements, specially designed instruction and appropriate accommodations. The special education program continues to provide ongoing PD on the evaluation and IEP processes, procedural safeguards, transition requirements, specially designed instruction and appropriate accommodations.   
  
The special education teachers of the target schools have been provided with ongoing professional development on the development of present levels of performance, goal development, and progress monitoring.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

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

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the CNMI PSS, Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input in the review and development of the CNMI Part B FFY 2019 Annual Performance Report (APR). Primary stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, and the State Board of Education reviewed current performance data to determine progress on the targets. It was discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets.   
  
In FFY 2013, the CNMI primary stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators for FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the 16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.  
  
OSEP’s Part B Determination Letter issued on June 25, 2020, the RDA Matrix, and the HTDMD document, showed how OSEP made the CNMI determination using compliance data reported in the APR and results data related to: (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments; (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out. It should be noted that the CNMI’s RDA 2020 determination was needs assistance, an improvement from the previous year's determination of needs intervention.

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

NO

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, 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

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, CNMI must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, CNMI must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, CNMI must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since CNMI's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Per OSEP's instruction, Indicator 17, the CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted no later than April 1, 2021. CNMI's SSIP Phase III Year 5 will include CNMI's FFY 2019 progress data for its SiMR and progress data and information on CNMI's SSIP implementation.   
  
Specific Conditions imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI for FFY 2019:   
1. Technical assistance received: CNMI continues to work with the Department’s Risk Management Service (RMS) to address CNMI’s Public School System (PSS) Special Conditions through onsite and other technical assistance. As a result of the technical assistance the CNMI PSS is no longer required to maintain and report on a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) but is required to submit a biannual report.   
2. Actions taken as a result of the RMS technical assistance: CNMI submits a biannual report with updates on its administration of Department grant funds, with an emphasis on areas of repeat audit findings. In addition, the CNMI PSS has   
o Increased communication and dialogue with Federal Fiscal Office;   
o Improved information sharing regarding CNMI's longstanding non-compliance Special Conditions;   
o Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years; and  
o Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Specific Conditions.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' FFY 2020 IDEA Part B grant award and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the determination.

## Intro - Required Actions

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

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 76.39% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 74.00% | 76.00% | 78.00% |  | 80.00% |
| Data | 82.00% | 80.00% | 82.00% | 76.39% | 89.86% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 80.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | 59 |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 65 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 90.77% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 59 | 65 | 89.86% | 80.00% | 90.77% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

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

Other

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

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)**

Effective FFY 2017, OSEP required CNMI to change its method for calculating graduation rates for Indicator 1, while maintaining the use of one year lag data. The FFY 2017 performance data therefore represents CNMI's baseline data for Indicator 1, which was accepted by OSEP.  
  
In FFY 2017, to ensure the CNMI is providing accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEPs, stakeholders reviewed the graduation and exit data, OSEP’s options for calculating and reporting graduation data and compared the data to existing calculations. With stakeholder input, the CNMI agreed to use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009) as its method for calculating graduation rates for Indicator 1. Therefore, beginning the FFY 2017 APR, the CNMI reports a graduation percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

## 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 dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2008 | 9.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 4.00% | 3.00% | 3.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% |
| Data | 4.45% | 7.46% | 8.78% | 5.07% | 2.17% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 2.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 59 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 6 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 0 |

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

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

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

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

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | **FFY** **2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 6 | 322 | 2.17% | 2.00% | 1.86% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

**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 below.**

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

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

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 93.00% | 93.50% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 78.00% | Actual | 92.02% | 91.89% | 90.95% | 91.46% | 95.04% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 93.00% | 93.50% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 85.00% | Actual | 92.23% | 92.76% | 84.99% | 92.08% | 95.66% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.  
  
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures throughout the nation, all schools did not administer the Spring 2020 state-wide assessments. Per OSEP's instruction, it is understood that Indicator 3 data will not be submitted by any state or entity for FFY 2019.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

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

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 95.04% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 95.66% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

The CNMI Assessment Results can be found on the following url link: https://www.cnmipss.org/special-education-program

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

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

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

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 11.00% | Actual | 4.00% | 5.01% | 6.07% | 7.52% | 3.26% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 20.00% | 30.00% | 40.00% | 50.00% | 60.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 10.00% | Actual | 7.98% | 6.86% | 8.83% | 9.73% | 4.75% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 60.00% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 60.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.  
  
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures throughout the nation, all schools did not administer the Spring 2020 state-wide assessments. Per OSEP's instruction, it is understood that Indicator 3 data will not be submitted by any state or entity for FFY 2019.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

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

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 3.26% | 60.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 4.75% | 60.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

The CNMI Assessment Results can be found on the following url link: https://www.cnmipss.org/special-education-program.

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

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2008 | 2.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of districts in the State** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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 2019 Indicator 4A was from 2018-2019 as follows:  
-Students without disabilities = 0.03% (3/9084)  
-Students with disabilities = 0.21% (2/968) - consistent with the 618 discipline data submitted in November 2019  
-Difference = 0.18%

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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:

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:**

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

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 81.00% | 82.00% | 83.00% | 84.00% | 85.00% |
| A | 68.00% | Data | 89.85% | 84.87% | 82.16% | 83.69% | 84.58% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 4.80% | 4.60% | 4.40% | 4.20% | 4.00% |
| B | 10.00% | Data | 2.10% | 2.14% | 2.04% | 2.74% | 2.10% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 0.70% | 0.70% | 0.70% | 0.70% | 0.70% |
| C | 1.00% | Data | 0.12% | 0.00% | 0.12% | 0.60% | 0.58% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 85.00% |
| Target B <= | 3.00% |
| Target C <= | 0.70% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 914 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 803 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 13 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 2 |

**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.**

YES

**Provide an explanation below**

CNMI transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten (KG) in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. Per OSEP’s instruction, CNMI opted to maintain the required reporting for Indicator 5 for FFY 2019 using the correct age range from the IDEA section 618 environments data.  
  
The FFY 2019 data for Indicator 5 represents children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 and does not include the 39 children with IEPs aged 5 served in KG reported in the CNMI 618 Child Count/Educational Environment data submitted in April 2020 for the December 1, 2019 618 Child Count/Environment data. The 39 children with IEPs aged 5 served in KG was removed from the numerator and denominator for 5A, and the denominator for 5B and 5C. These 39 children with IEPs aged 5 served in KG have been reported in Indicator 6.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 764 | 875 | 84.58% | 85.00% | 87.31% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 13 | 875 | 2.10% | 3.00% | 1.49% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 2 | 875 | 0.58% | 0.70% | 0.23% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 78.00% | 80.00% | 82.00% | 84.00% | 86.00% |
| A | 85.00% | Data | 88.10% | 83.87% | 85.87% | 87.07% | 78.70% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| B | 0.00% | Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 86.00% |
| Target B <= | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 78 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | 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 | 49 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 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.**

YES

**Provide an explanation below**

CNMI transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten (KG) in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. Per OSEP’s instruction, CNMI opted to maintain the required reporting for Indicator 6 for FFY 2019 using the correct age range from the IDEA section 618 environments data.  
  
The FFY 2019 data reported for Indicator 6 includes all children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served, including 39 reported children with IEPs aged 5 served in KG. These 39 reported KG children with an IEP were included in the numerator and denominator for 6A and the denominator for 6B. The FFY 2019 Indicator 6 performance percentages are 75.21% (88/117) for 6A and 0% (0/117) for 6B.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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 | 88 | 117 | 78.70% | 86.00% | 62.82% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 0 | 117 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | It is understood that the determination of where students receive their special education and related services is an individualized decision based on the IEP Team. The reason for the slippage or the decrease in percentage of preschoolers with disabilities receiving the majority of their special education and related services in a regular early childhood program is possibly a result of the increase in the total number of preschoolers with disabilities served from 108 in FFY 2018 to 117 in FFY 2019. By numbers, there was an increase of three preschoolers with disabilities reported in 6A from 85 in FFY 2018 to 88 in FFY 2019.  It should be noted that CNMI's performance of 75.21% for 6A in FFY 2019 is significantly above the national data of 50% in FFY 2018 for Indicator 6A based on OSEP's 2020 FFY 2018 SPP/APR indicator Analysis Booklet. |

**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** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 91.50% | 92.50% | 93.50% | 95.00% | 96.50% |
| A1 | 96.00% | Data | 72.73% | 83.33% | 75.00% | 100.00% | 89.47% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 49.00% | 51.00% | 53.00% | 55.00% | 57.00% |
| A2 | 37.00% | Data | 61.54% | 68.75% | 68.09% | 39.02% | 39.13% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 92.00% | 94.00% | 96.00% | 98.00% | 100.00% |
| B1 | 100.00% | Data | 84.85% | 90.63% | 62.50% | 97.44% | 91.30% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 29.00% | 30.00% | 30.00% | 31.00% | 31.00% |
| B2 | 22.00% | Data | 33.33% | 46.88% | 31.91% | 19.51% | 13.04% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 89.00% | 91.00% | 93.00% | 95.00% | 96.50% |
| C1 | 96.20% | Data | 74.07% | 95.24% | 59.26% | 100.00% | 89.74% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 71.00% | 71.50% | 71.50% | 72.00% | 72.50% |
| C2 | 44.40% | Data | 51.28% | 68.75% | 59.57% | 41.46% | 36.96% |

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**FFY 2019 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 | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 17 | 48.57% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 14 | 40.00% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 11.43% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 31 | 31 | 89.47% | 96.50% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 18 | 35 | 39.13% | 57.00% | 51.43% | Did Not Meet 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 | 25 | 71.43% |
| 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 | 2 | 5.71% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 32 | 33 | 91.30% | 100.00% | 96.97% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 9 | 35 | 13.04% | 31.00% | 25.71% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 0 | 0.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 15 | 42.86% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 15 | 42.86% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 5 | 14.29% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 30 | 30 | 89.74% | 96.50% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 20 | 35 | 36.96% | 72.50% | 57.14% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

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

YES

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

Instruments and Procedures Used: All children eligible for Part B Early Childhood Special Education Services upon entry into the program and having received at least SIX months of services shall participate in the Early Childhood Special Education Outcome Measurement System process.   
  
The Child Outcome Summary (COS) process consists of four key features of 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.

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

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

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 78.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 82.00% | 84.00% | 86.00% | 88.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | 90.65% | 90.07% | 91.34% | 92.31% | 93.53% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 90.00% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  | 93.53% | 90.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

**Percentage of respondent parents**

**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.**

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | NO |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | 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.**

**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.**

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

Dissemination of the FFY 2019 parent surveys was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and school closure. Annually, the parent surveys are distributed to schools to disseminate to parents in April with a return date by the month of May. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, CNMI schools were closed on March 16, 2020 before the parent surveys could be distributed to the schools. CNMI therefore was not able to provide Indicator 8 performance data for FFY 2019.  
  
Throughout the school closure, CNMI PSS continued to provide information to families of children with an IEP through the Public School System (PSS) announcements. Specific activities for parents of children with an IEP included:  
-Special Education Teachers communicated with parents and students on a weekly basis via phone, email, or videoconference platforms (messenger, whatsapp, google meet, etc.) to follow-up on the enrichment packets distributed to all students, including supports and strategies for at-home activities, for the remainder of the 2019-2020 school year.  
-Surveys conducted with families regarding their technology and internet capacity to determine needs in preparation for online learning. CNMI PSS provided students with a laptop or ipad and access to wifi to engage in the online learning.  
-PSS website was updated with guidelines and resources regarding services for students with an IEP.  
-District and school-level parent sessions included discussion on any issues related to special education.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not provide any data for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands met its target.

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 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 instruction, Indicator 9 does not apply to the CNMI.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 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 instruction, Indicator 10 does not apply to the CNMI.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

This indictor is not applicable to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

## 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 53.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.47% | 98.45% | 97.96% | 99.11% | 96.53% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 137 | 129 | 96.53% | 100% | 94.16% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

CNMI's FFY 2019 Indicator 11 performance represented substantial compliance of 94.16% (129/137), but represented slippage by 2.37% from the previous year's substantial compliance of 96.53% (195/202). By numbers, this represented a difference of one initial evaluation from seven in FFY 2018 to eight in FFY 2019 that did not meet the 60-day timeline requirement for Indicator 11.  
  
The COVID-19 pandemic impacted school operations, which impacted the completion of initial evaluations of parent consents to evaluate received prior to the school closure on March 16, 2020.   
  
Of the eight parent consents to evaluate received for the reporting period, a total of seven parent consents to evaluate were received prior to schools closing in mid-March 2020 and continued to be pending at the end of the reporting period. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic delayed the completion of these seven initial evaluations. Reasons included:  
-Personnel having to adjust to administering tests virtually.  
-CNMI’s austerity limited the availability of furloughed general education teachers who had information about the concerns regarding the students prior to schools closing. General education teachers were furloughed from April 1, 2020 – August 26, 2020.  
-CNMI PSS implemented a 4-day work/school week, which limited access to general education personnel.  
-CNMI PSS implemented distance learning with limited face-to-face interventions beginning the new school year 2020-2021. Parents indicated that they will wait until school is back in session.  
-CNMI PSS implemented an online school registration system, which resulted in issues for students transitioning or transferring to another school at the beginning of school year 2020-2021.

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

8

**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 eight initial evaluations accounted for under (a) but not included in (b) were from four elementary schools (GTC, KAG, SVS, WSR) and two middle schools (HMS and TMS). One of the eight initial evaluations were completed over timeline prior to the closing of schools in mid-March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the remaining seven initial evaluations represented parent consents received prior to the closing of schools in mid-March 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which remained pending at the end of the reporting period.  
  
The days beyond the 60-day timeline was 42 days and 252 days for two initial evaluations; one of which was completed after the reporting period due to the impact of COVID-19. The remaining six initial evaluations not completed are still pending due to the COVID-19 pandemic and are anticipated to be completed in the month of February 2021.  
  
The reasons for delay include non-adherence to procedures for one initial evaluation and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic for seven initial evaluations. As described under the slippage explanation, CNMI PSS closed schools which required school personnel to adjust its support to students from face-to-face to virtual. Virtual learning also impacted the ability for CNMI PSS to administer appropriate assessments for eligibility determination.

**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, 2019 to June 30, 2020. 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 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 7 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The FFY 2018 Findings were verified as corrected through a review of updated data of actual initial evaluation documents from the three schools that received the Written Notice of Findings. These actual initial evaluation documents were submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the State data system. The review of the actual initial evaluation documents resulted in the three schools determined to have verified correction of the initial evaluation regulatory requirement with the updated data demonstrating 100% compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement. In December 2019, a total of nine initial evaluations for the three schools were the updated data submitted to the PSS Special Education Program for review and input into the State data system. All nine initial evaluations were 100% in compliance with the 60-day timeline requirement, which confirmed that these schools were correctly implementing the 60-day initial evaluation regulatory requirement, which resulted in them receiving a Written Notice of Timely Correction.

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

As documented in the FFY 2018 performance data for Indicator 11, seven initial evaluations from three schools were not completed in a timely manner. These schools were issued a Written Notice of Findings because the initial evaluations were not completed within the 60-day timeline. Although late, all instances of noncompliance were verified to be completed through a review of actual initial evaluation documents submitted to PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, as reported in FFY 2018 for Indicator 11. In addition, through a review of updated data of a total of nine actual initial evaluations submitted to the PSS Special Education Program for input into the special education database, the three schools demonstrated 100% compliance with the updated data of initial evaluations demonstrating 100% verified timely correction and received a Written Notice of Timely Correction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 96.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.30% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 43 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 8 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 30 |
| 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. | 5 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 0 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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. | 30 | 30 | 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 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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**: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 77.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 183 | 220 | 100.00% | 100% | 83.18% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted school operations, which affected the completion of annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) reviews during the school closure from March 16, 2020 through June 15, 2020.  
  
CNMI’s FFY 2019 Indicator 13 performance of 83.18% (183/220) represented students with an IEP who were 16 years old or older by June 30, 2020 who had the required secondary transition elements indicated in their IEP. This left 16.82% or 37 IEPs without the required secondary transition elements indicated in their IEP that were due for an annual IEP review during the school closure period. Reasons for this slippage from previous reporting period include:  
-CNMI’s austerity limited the availability of furloughed general education teachers who had information regarding the students prior to schools closing. General education teachers were furloughed from April 1, 2020 – August 26, 2020.  
-CNMI PSS implemented a 4-day work/school week, which limited access to general education personnel.  
-Schools implemented distance learning with limited face-to-face interventions beginning October 2020. Parents indicated that they will wait until school is back in session.  
-CNMI PSS implemented an online school registration system, which resulted in issues for students transitioning or transferring to another school at the beginning of school year 2020-2021.  
-Personnel error with not scheduling annual IEP reviews.

**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)**

As of the date of this report submission, CNMI reports that of the 37 IEPs that did not meet the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements in the FFY 2019 reporting period, 31 or 83.78% have met the Indicator 13 secondary transition requirements. The remaining six IEPs are anticipated to be completed in the month of February 2021.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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

Because the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

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

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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

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

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

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

**II. *Data Reporting***

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

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

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

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

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

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 14.00% | 16.00% | 18.00% | 19.00% | 20.00% |
| A | 10.00% | Data | 25.45% | 16.98% | 10.17% | 12.24% | 16.13% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 52.00% | 55.00% | 58.00% | 61.00% | 63.00% |
| B | 62.00% | Data | 47.27% | 37.74% | 61.02% | 48.98% | 72.58% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 63.00% | 69.00% | 75.00% | 81.00% | 87.00% |
| C | 86.00% | Data | 50.91% | 43.40% | 64.41% | 61.22% | 75.81% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 20.00% |
| Target B >= | 63.00% |
| Target C >= | 87.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. In 2019, the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), provided input on additional targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2019. This FFY 2019 APR includes current performance data on 14 of the16 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 and additional targets for Results Indicator through FFY 2019. The remaining two indicators, 9 and 10, do not apply to the CNMI.   
  
CNMI stakeholders discussed that the FFY 2019 APR represented the last reporting year of the current SPP cycle. Stakeholders agreed that CNMI should not make any revisions to the FFY 2019 results targets. Therefore, for each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2019 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2019 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2020 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI’s FFY 2018 SPP/APR. Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 5 will be submitted as required no later than April 1, 2021.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 58 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 5 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 28 |
| 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) | 4 |
| 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 5 | 58 | 16.13% | 20.00% | 8.62% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 33 | 58 | 72.58% | 63.00% | 56.90% | Did Not Meet Target | 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) | 37 | 58 | 75.81% | 87.00% | 63.79% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | All Indicator 14 measures – A, B, and C – represented slippage from the previous reporting period. Possible reasons for slippage include: • Limited employment opportunities in the CNMI due to economic issues since Super Typhoon Yutu. • Disability required ongoing medical support. • Taking care of his/her newborn or caring for family members. • Moved off-island and continue to look for a job. |
| **B** | All Indicator 14 measures – A, B, and C – represented slippage from the previous reporting period. Possible reasons for slippage include: • Limited employment opportunities in the CNMI due to economic issues since Super Typhoon Yutu. • Disability required ongoing medical support. • Taking care of his/her newborn or caring for family members. • Moved off-island and continue to look for a job. |
| **C** | All Indicator 14 measures – A, B, and C – represented slippage from the previous reporting period. Possible reasons for slippage include: • Limited employment opportunities in the CNMI due to economic issues since Super Typhoon Yutu. • Disability required ongoing medical support. • Taking care of his/her newborn or caring for family members. • Moved off-island and continue to look for a job. |

**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.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

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

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

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

CNMI’s analysis of Indicator 14 response rate representation included a review of the 65 leavers: 59 who graduated with a high school diploma, and 6 who dropped out of high school. Fifty-Eight (58) of the 65 leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey for an overall response rate of 89.23%. The 58 respondents represented the following:  
  
-Exit Categories: 93.22% (55/59) who graduated with a high school diploma completed the survey and 50% (3/6) who dropped out completed the survey. Overall, leavers who graduated with a high school diploma represented 90.77% (59/65) of all leavers, a similar percentage to the respondents who graduated with a high school diploma at 94.83% (55/58).  
  
-Ethnicity: Based on the IDEA ethnicity categories of the leavers, the respondents represented 85.37% (35/41) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 90% (9/10) Asians, and 100% (14/14) two or more races. Overall, the majority of leavers was represented in the Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander category at 70.69% (41/65), which was consistent with the majority of respondents identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.  
   
-Gender: The respondents represented 58.62% (34/58) identified as male and 41.38% (24/58) identified as female. The overall male gender representation of the leavers was 60% (39/65), similar to the percentage of respondents who were identified as male.  
  
-Disability: The majority of leavers were identified as having a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) at 56.92% (37/65). The respondents therefore represented the majority SLD disability category at 55.17% (32/58); a similar percentage to the overall leaver SLD disability representation. Further, there were eight other disability categories represented as leavers: HI, ID, MD, OHI, ED, SLI, DB and AUT, representing 43.08% (28/65) of the leavers. All eight “other” disability categories were represented as respondents at 44.83% (26/58), which represented 26 of the 28 leavers with an “other” disability category.

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

**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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 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**

The CNMI reported that there were no resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. Per OSEP's instruction, the CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 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**

The CNMI reported that there were no mediations held in FFY 2019. Per OSEP's instruction, the CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 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

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# 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:**

pss.coe@cnmipss.org

**Phone:**

670287-8444

**Submitted on:**

04/28/21 12:36:44 AM

# ED Attachments

  