

# MP Part B

# FFY2017 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

This Executive Summary includes a description of CNMI's IDEA Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2017. 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 2017 APR.

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. This FFY 2017 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. As per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 3A, 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2017 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2017 targets, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2018 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2016 SPP/APR.

Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase III Year 3 will be submitted as required no later than April 2, 2019.

## Required Response for FFY 2017 "Needs Intervention" Determination:

OSEP determined the CNMI needs intervention in implementing Part B of IDEA. As required, CNMI provides the following information to meet the Secretary's reporting requirements for Indicator 1 and other concerns stated in the June 28, 2018 FFY 2016 Part B Determination Letter. The determination was based on the totality of the CNMI's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2016 State Performance Plan /Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other state reported data and other publicly available information.

## Graduation Rate Calculation:

OSEP's Part B Determination Letter issued on June 28, 2018, indicated the CNMI must calculate its graduation rate using one of two options when reporting graduation data in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, due on February 1, 2019, and subsequent SPP/APRs: In order to ensure the CNMI is providing accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEP's, the CNMI is required use a four year adjusted cohort rate required under the ESEA or use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (file specification FS009). SESAP members agreed the 618 data reported to the Department is most accurate and consistent to report graduation rate.

## Specific Conditions imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI for FFY 2018:

1. Technical assistance received: CNMI continues to work with the Department's Risk Management Service (RMS) to address CNMI's Public School System Special Conditions through onsite and other technical assistance. As a result of the technical assistance the CNMI PSS is no longer required to maintain and report on a CAP but is required to submit a biannual report.
2. Actions taken as a result of the RMS technical assistance: CNMI submits a biannual report with updates on its administration of Department grant funds, with an emphasis on areas of repeat audit finding's. In addition, the CNMI PSS has
  - Increased communication and dialogue with Federal Fiscal Office;
  - Improved information sharing regarding CNMI's longstanding non-compliance Special Conditions;
  - Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years; and
  - Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Specific Conditions
  - Completed and submitted timely audit reports over the past five years; and
  - Conducted the required activities and continues to demonstrate progress towards addressing the Special Conditions

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

1

## General Supervision System:

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

### General Supervision System:

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 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 Public School System 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.

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

## Technical Assistance System:

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

### TA Systems

The 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 Collaborative 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 for targeted and onsite technical assistance.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### 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.

#### Professional Development System

The PSS has in place a system of professional development 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 professional development hours per contract year and to participate in 10 professional development events during the school year. Two (2) of the 10 days are designated PD specific to PSS system wide initiatives and 8 days are specific to school level needs.

In school year 2017-2018, 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 professional development:

- The Office of Curriculum and Instruction selected a new Language Arts curriculum for K to 6th. PD has been provided to all elementary schools on the reading curriculum and the essential components of reading.
- Reading and Literacy Coaching is now implemented in all elementary schools. The "Literacy" coaches were provided professional development and mentoring on coaching mythologies and strategies.
- A universal screening has been implemented in all K to 3rd. All teachers, Literacy Coaches and Title I teachers were provided professional development on the implementation of the screening procedures with fidelity to ensure the screening data is valid and reliable. The training included the data collection and use to make instructional based decisions.

The special education program continues to provide ongoing professional development 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.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

#### Stakeholder Involvement

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input in the review and development of the CNMI Part B FFY 2017-2018 Annual Performance Report (APR). Primary stakeholders (Special Education State Advisory Panel and school administrators) reviewed current performance data to determine progress on the targets, OSEP's Part B Determination Letter issued on June 28, 2018, the RDA Matrix, and the HTDMD document, which shows how OSEP made the CNMI determination using compliance and results data related to: (1) the participation of children with disabilities (CWD) on regular Statewide assessments; (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and(3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out. OSEP identifies a State or Entity as needing intervention under IDEA Part B if its RDA Percentage is less than 60%. The CNMI's RDA Percentage was 53%.

SESAP members also reviewed the graduate data (Indicator 1), and OSEP's required action for the CNMI to calculate its graduation rate using one of two options when reporting graduation data in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, due on February 1, 2019, and subsequent SPP/APRs: In order to ensure the CNMI is providing accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEP's, the CNMI is to use a four year adjusted cohort rate required under the ESEA or the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (file specification FS009). SESAP members agreed the 618 data reported to the Department is most accurate and consistent to report graduation rate.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 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 2016 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 2016 APR in 2018, 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 GRADS360 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/student-support-services/>.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Graduation**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			69.00%	75.00%	75.00%	81.00%	84.00%	87.00%	93.00%	72.00%	74.00%
Data		81.30%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	71.00%	59.00%	78.00%	71.00%	72.58%	82.00%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	76.00%	78.00%
Data	80.00%	82.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		80.00%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

OSEP's response to CNMI's FFY 2016 APR Indicator 1 required CNMI to change its method for calculating graduation rates effective FFY 2017.

As required by OSEP, beginning FFY 2017, CNMI will use Option 2 to calculate its graduation rate, which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009). Therefore the CNMI reports a graduation percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age, and died) in the denominator.

With OSEP's requirement to change its methodology for Indicator 1, CNMI is re-establishing baseline in FFY 2017. Further, with the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP)/stakeholder input, CNMI will maintain its FFY 2018 target of 80%, which is an increase from its FFY 2017 baseline.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

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 and have agreed to use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009). Therefore the CNMI reports a graduation percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator. For example, for 2016-2017, the percentage is calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the exit reason category graduated with a regular high school diploma by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died), then multiplying the result by 100.

FFY 17 is considered baseline data based on OSEP's response to CNMI FFY 16 APR graduation rate data. SESAP members agreed not to revise the graduation rate FFY 2018 target at this time.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	null	55
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	null	72
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>		Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

OSEP's response to CNMI's FFY 2016 APR Indicator 1 required CNMI to change its method for calculating graduation rates effective FFY 2017.

As required by OSEP, beginning FFY 2017, CNMI will use Option 2 to calculate its graduation rate, which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009). Therefore the CNMI reports a graduation percentage using 55 (number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma) in the numerator and 72 (number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories: graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age, and died) in the denominator, consistent with CNMI's 2016-2017 IDEA Section 618 Exit data.

With OSEP's requirement to change its methodology for Indicator 1, CNMI is re-establishing baseline in FFY 2017. Further, with the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP)/stakeholder input, CNMI will maintain its FFY 2018 target of 80%, which is an increase from its FFY 2017 baseline.

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
55	72	82.00%		76.39%

**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.

As required by OSEP, beginning FFY 2017, CNMI will use Option 2 to calculate its graduation rate, which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009).

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above?**  No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

Because CNMI is not required to report a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, CNMI may use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009).

Therefore, CNMI must calculate its graduation rate using one of the following two options when reporting data under Indicator 1 in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, due on February 1, 2019, and subsequent SPP/APRs:

(1) CNMI may report a four year adjusted cohort rate required under the ESEA. The definition of adjusted four-year cohort graduation rate data for the purposes of submitting data files to EDFacts is "the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class." From the beginning of 9th grade (or the earliest high school grade), students who are entering that grade for the first time form a cohort that is "adjusted" by adding any students who subsequently transfer into the cohort and subtracting any students who subsequently transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die. For example for 2016-2017, the numerator is the number of cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the 2016-2017 and the denominator is the number of first-time 9th graders in fall 2013 (starting cohort) plus students who transferred in, minus students who transferred out, emigrated, or died during school years 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17;or

(2) CNMI may use the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA(File specification FS009). If CNMI chooses this option, CNMI must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator. For example, for 2016-2017, the percentage must be calculated by dividing the number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the exit reason category graduated with a regular high school diploma by the total number of students ages 14 through 21 served under IDEA Part B, reported in the five exit-from-both-special education-and-school categories (graduated with a regular high school diploma, received a certificate, dropped out, reached maximum age for services, and died), then multiplying the result by 100.

CNMI must use one of the two options provided above in its FFY 2017 SPP/APR and subsequent submissions to ensure that it is providing a more accurate and consistent graduation rate for students with IEPs. CNMI may also include, in addition to one of the two options, CNMI's current method of calculating its graduation rate. Please note that OSEP will use only one of the two options for the purposes of OSEP's SPP/APR review and response process.

OSEP suggests that CNMI work with the IDEA Data Center, or another OSEP-funded National Technical Assistance Provider for additional guidance.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response**

**CNMI Response to Action Required:**

To ensure the CNMI provides 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 comparisons of the existing methods for calculating the graduation rate. After a thorough review and discussion, the stakeholders agreed to use Option 2 which is the same data reported to the Department under Section 618 of IDEA (File specification FS009). Therefore the CNMI reports a graduation percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited school due to receiving a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

FFY 17 is considered baseline data based on OSEP's response to CNMI FFY 16 APR graduation rate data. SESAP members agreed not to revise the FFY 2018 target at this time.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	1.00%	0%	0%	4.00%	4.00%
Data		10.00%	7.00%	9.00%	9.00%	2.90%	5.50%	5.70%	5.00%	2.47%	4.45%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	3.00%	3.00%
Data	7.46%	8.78%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

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? No

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
17	335	8.78%	2.00%	5.07%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

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

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).

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

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.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92.00%	93.00%
			Data		78.00%	93.00%	97.00%	96.70%	94.00%	95.80%	97.80%	95.00%	92.44%	92.02%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92.00%	93.00%
			Data		85.00%	95.00%	96.00%	96.90%	95.00%	96.50%	95.00%	95.00%	92.44%	92.23%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	93.50%	94.00%
		Data	91.89%	90.95%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	93.50%	94.00%
		Data	92.76%	84.99%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	94.50%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	94.50%	95.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	480	439	90.95%	94.50%	91.46%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	480	442	84.99%	94.50%	92.08%

**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.cnmjps.org/student-support-services/>

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			15.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%
			Data		11.00%	7.00%	12.00%	28.30%	23.00%	24.00%	16.60%	8.00%	21.59%	4.00%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			15.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	20.00%	20.00%
			Data		10.00%	10.00%	13.00%	27.30%	24.00%	28.00%	21.00%	8.00%	23.41%	7.98%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	30.00%	40.00%
		Data	5.01%	6.07%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	30.00%	40.00%
		Data	6.86%	8.83%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	50.00%	60.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	50.00%	60.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	439	33	6.07%	50.00%	7.52%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A Overall	442	43	8.83%	50.00%	9.73%

**Public Reporting Information**

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

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The CNMI Assessment Results can be found on the following url link: <https://www.cnmipss.org/student-support-services/>.

CNMI PSS does not report data by schools for special education students due to low "n" size.

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

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; and
- 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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0.40%	0.35%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0.30%	1.73%	2.80%	2.40%	1.18%	1.38%	1.31%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	1	0%	0%	0%

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- 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.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

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

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

**Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable**

Per OSEP instructions, Indicator 4B does not apply to the CNM

*Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE*

**Compliance 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; and
- 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))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance**

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			68.00%	70.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	81.00%
		Data		68.00%	74.00%	74.00%	75.40%	82.70%	84.80%	88.00%	88.00%	91.09%	89.85%
B	2005	Target ≤			5.40%	5.30%	5.30%	5.20%	5.20%	5.20%	5.20%	5.00%	4.80%
		Data		10.00%	8.00%	8.00%	3.40%	1.80%	2.10%	1.20%	1.50%	1.83%	2.10%
C	2005	Target ≤			1.00%	0.90%	0.90%	0%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%
		Data		1.00%	0.14%	0.14%	0.27%	0.25%	0.20%	0.30%	0.20%	0.24%	0.12%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	82.00%	83.00%
	Data	84.87%	82.16%
B	Target ≤	4.60%	4.40%
	Data	2.14%	2.04%
C	Target ≤	0.70%	0.70%
	Data	0%	0.12%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	84.00%	85.00%
Target B ≤	4.20%	4.00%
Target C ≤	0.70%	0.70%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	840	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	703	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	23	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	5	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	703	840	82.16%	84.00%	83.69%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	23	840	2.04%	4.20%	2.74%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	5	840	0.12%	0.70%	0.60%

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									86.00%	76.00%	78.00%
		Data								85.00%	76.00%	79.31%	88.10%
B	2011	Target ≤									0%	0%	0%
		Data								0%	0%	0%	0%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	80.00%	82.00%
	Data	83.87%	85.87%
B	Target ≤	0%	0%
	Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	84.00%	86.00%
Target B ≤	0%	0%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	116	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">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</a>	101	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early	101	116	85.87%	84.00%	87.07%

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
childhood program					
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	116	0%	0%	0%

Use a different calculation methodology

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						96.00%	96.50%	96.50%	96.50%	90.00%	91.50%
		Data					96.00%	100%	82.90%	95.00%	86.00%	90.48%	72.73%
A2	2008	Target ≥						42.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	49.00%
		Data					37.00%	33.00%	53.80%	47.00%	52.00%	54.84%	61.54%
B1	2008	Target ≥						100%	100%	100%	100%	90.00%	92.00%
		Data					100%	95.00%	87.20%	84.00%	89.00%	100%	84.85%
B2	2008	Target ≥						27.00%	54.00%	54.00%	54.00%	29.00%	29.00%
		Data					22.00%	38.00%	43.60%	33.00%	30.00%	29.03%	33.33%
C1	2008	Target ≥						96.00%	96.50%	96.50%	96.50%	86.50%	89.00%
		Data					96.20%	90.00%	81.30%	91.00%	90.00%	86.96%	74.07%
C2	2008	Target ≥						49.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	70.50%	71.00%
		Data					44.40%	48.00%	59.00%	67.00%	63.00%	70.97%	51.28%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	92.50%	93.50%
	Data	83.33%	75.00%
A2	Target ≥	51.00%	53.00%
	Data	68.75%	68.09%
B1	Target ≥	94.00%	96.00%
	Data	90.63%	62.50%
B2	Target ≥	30.00%	30.00%
	Data	46.88%	31.91%
C1	Target ≥	91.00%	93.00%
	Data	95.24%	59.26%
C2	Target ≥	71.50%	71.50%
	Data	68.75%	59.57%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	95.00%	96.50%
Target A2 ≥	55.00%	57.00%
Target B1 ≥	98.00%	100%
Target B2 ≥	31.00%	31.00%
Target C1 ≥	95.00%	96.50%
Target C2 ≥	72.00%	72.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	41
------------------------------------------------------------------	----

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	25	60.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9	21.95%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7	17.07%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	34.00	34.00	75.00%	95.00%	100%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	16.00	41.00	68.09%	55.00%	39.02%

### Reasons for A2 Slippage

For FFY 2017 there were 41 preschoolers with IEPs that participated in this measurement. Sixteen or 39% of the 41 preschoolers that exited were in categories "d" children who improved functioning to reach level comparable to same-aged peers (9 preschoolers) and "e" – children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers (7 preschoolers) in the area of positive social emotional skills including social relationships.

CNMI's performance for this year is 39% of children who were functioning with age expectation in the area of positive social emotional skills. This is a slippage of 28.31% in comparison to FFY 2016 performance of 67.31%. In reviewing possible reasons for the slippage, the Program drill down data specifically focused on the number of children in category "c": children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers. The following data points were reviewed and analyzed:

- Age of entry
- Length of service
- Disability
- If received early intervention services
- Settings

Stakeholders specifically reviewed data of the 25 preschoolers that fell in category "c" children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it in the area of positive social emotional skills.

Age of entry. Based on the data drill down, 20 preschoolers were 3 years of age and five preschoolers were four years of age when they began to receive early childhood special education services.

Length of services. Eleven (11) received early childhood special education services for more than 24 months; 10 received more than 13 months of services; and 4 preschoolers received less than 12 months of services.

Disability. Eleven preschoolers were identified as developmental delay; 12 preschoolers with autism; 2 with intellectual disabilities.

Received early intervention services. There were 16 preschoolers that received early intervention services and 9 did not.

Settings. Twenty-one of the preschoolers are in Head Start classroom; 3 received home services; and 1 in child care.

Upon review of the data and discussion with stakeholders, there are several potential reasons for the slippage –

- There are preschoolers with significant disabilities that have shown improvement at a slower rate and will continue to need special education and related services;
- There is a need for ongoing training for Early Childhood Special Education staff on age anchoring skills and using the applied practice process with staff on specific cases studies.

In addition, stakeholders discussed the issue with the alignment of the rating and the Summary Statement Category. There were children that were rated a 1 rating at entry and at exit was rated by the Team a 2 or 3 rating. The ECO Calculator noted these children in Category "C". Children in category "c" are "Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach." However, for children with an exit rating of a "2 or 3" have functioning skills at a foundational level and may have some immediate foundational skills as noted in the Decision Tree tool. Perhaps ECTAC needs to look more closely and align the Tools with the categories identified in the Outcome Measurement calculator.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1	2.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	32	78.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	14.63%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2	4.88%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6	38.00	39.00	62.50%	98.00%	97.44%

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$					
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	8.00	41.00	31.91%	31.00%	19.51%

### Reasons for B2 Slippage

For FFY 2017 there were 41 preschoolers with IEPs that participated in this measurement. Eight or 19.5% of the 41 preschoolers that exited were in categories "d" children who improved functioning to reach level comparable to same-aged peers (9 preschoolers) and "e" – children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers (7 preschoolers) in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills including early language, communication, and early literacy.

CNMI's performance for this year is 19.5% of children who were functioning with age expectation in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills. This is a slippage of 19.1% in comparison to FFY 2016 performance of 38.64%. In reviewing possible reasons for the slippage, the Program drill down data specifically focused on the number of children in category "c" children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers. The following data points were reviewed and analysed:

- Age of entry
- Length of service
- Disability
- If received early intervention services
- Settings

Stakeholders specifically reviewed data of the 32 preschoolers that fell in category "c" children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills.

Age of entry. Based on the data drill down, 26 preschoolers were 3 years of age and 6 preschoolers were four years of age when they began to receive early childhood special education services.

Length of services. Fifteen (15) received early childhood special education services for more than 24 months, 12 received more than 13 months of services and 5 preschoolers received less than 12 months of services.

Disability. Seventeen preschoolers were identified as developmental delay, 12 preschoolers with autism, 2 with intellectual disabilities, and 1 orthopedic impaired.

Received early intervention services. There were 22 preschoolers that received early intervention services and 10 did not.

Settings. Twenty-six (26) of the preschoolers are in Head Start classroom, 5 received home services, and 1 in child care.

Upon review of the data and discussion with stakeholders, there are several potential reasons for the slippage –

- There are preschoolers with significant disabilities that have shown improvement at a slower rate and will continue to need special education and related services;
- There is a need for ongoing training for Early Childhood Special Education staff on age anchoring skills and using the applied practice process with staff on specific cases studies.

In addition, stakeholders discussed the issue with the alignment of the rating and the Summary Statement Category. There were children that were rated a 1 rating at entry and at exit was rated by the Team a 2 or 3 rating. The ECO Calculator noted these children in Category "C". Children in category "c" are "Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach." However, for children with an exit rating of a "2 or 3" have functioning skills at a foundational level and may have some immediate foundational skills as noted in the Decision Tree tool. Perhaps ECTAC needs to look more closely and align the Tools with the categories identified in the Outcome Measurement calculator.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	24	58.54%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9	21.95%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	19.51%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	33.00	33.00	59.26%	95.00%	100%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	17.00	41.00	59.57%	72.00%	41.46%

### Reasons for C2 Slippage

For FFY 2017 there were 41 preschoolers with IEPs that participated in this measurement. Seventeen or 41.5% of the 41 preschoolers that exited were in categories "d" children who improved functioning to reach level comparable to same-aged peers (9 preschoolers) and "e" – children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers (7 preschoolers) in the area of use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

CNMI's performance for this year is 41.5% of children who were functioning with age expectation in the area of use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. This is a slippage of 31.23% in comparison to FFY 2016 performance of 72.73%. In reviewing possible reasons for the slippage, the Program drill down data specifically focused on the number of children in category "c" children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers. The following data points were reviewed and analysed:

- Age of entry
- Length of service
- Disability
- If received early intervention services
- Settings

Stakeholders specifically reviewed data of the 24 preschoolers that fell in category "c" children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it in the area of acquisition of knowledge and skills.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Age of entry. Based on the data drill down, 19 preschoolers were 3 years of age and 5 preschoolers were four years of age when they began to receive early childhood special education services.

Length of services. Twelve (12) received early childhood special education services for more than 24 months, 6 received more than 13 months of services and 6 preschoolers received less than 12 months of services.

Disability. Nine (9) preschoolers were identified as developmental delay, 12 preschoolers with autism, 2 with intellectual disabilities, and 1 orthopedic impaired.

Received early intervention services. There were 15 preschoolers that received early intervention services and 9 did not.

- Settings. Twenty (20) of the preschoolers are in Head Start classroom and 4 received home services.

Upon review of the data and discussion with stakeholders, there are several potential reasons for the slippage –

- There are preschoolers with significant disabilities that have shown improvement at a slower rate and will continue to need special education and related services;
- There is a need for ongoing training for Early Childhood Special Education staff on age anchoring skills and using the applied practice process with staff on specific cases studies.

In addition, stakeholders discussed the issue with the alignment of the rating and the Summary Statement Category. There were children that were rated a 1 rating at entry and at exit was rated by the Team a 2 or 3 rating. The ECO Calculator noted these children in Category "C". Children in category "c" are "Children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach." However, for children with an exit rating of a "2 or 3" have functioning skills at a foundational level and may have some immediate foundational skills as noted in the Decision Tree tool. Perhaps ECTAC needs to look more closely and align the Tools with the categories identified in the Outcome Measurement calculator.

**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

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?** Yes

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

All children eligible for Part B Early Childhood Special Education Services upon entry into the program and will receive at least SIX month of services shall participate in the Early Childhood Special Education Outcome Measurement System process.

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

- Uses **information from multiple sources.** The process produces a description of the child's functioning at a single point in time by synthesizing multiple sources of information. Multiple source of information is used to determine the status of the COS. Most of the information needed is already collected as part of the development of the child's IEP and therefore, collecting child assessment information is currently part of the IEP development process and is not an added step. Multiple sources of information are used to make decisions regarding the child's performance related to the three child outcomes. Data sources include:
  - The Hawaii Early Learning Profile
  - Other assessment results if appropriate
  - Parent and other caregiver information
  - Child observations
  - Early Childhood Special Education Service provider observations and input
- Relies on **team-based discussion and team decision making.** This approach is a team process, involving professionals and family members contributing to decision-making. The COS process is designed to be a team consensus process where each individual member contributes information about the child's functioning across a variety of setting and situations. The members of the team participate collectively in a discussion to determine the child's rating. The child's family is an important member of the COS team. The family provides critical information about the child. The family may not be familiar with the COS process but they are experts on what their child is doing across settings and situations. The team shall include family members, professionals who work with the child, and others familiar with the child's functioning such as child care providers. Teams can range in size from two people to as many the parent and team feels is needed.
- Uses a **7-point rating scale** to describe the child's function across settings and situations. The process involves team members using the information gathered about a child to rate his or her functioning in each of the three outcome areas on a 7-point scale. Using the 7-point rating scale requires the team to compare the child's skills and behaviors with those expected for his or her age. The purpose of the rating is to document current functioning. The COS process results in a rating for each of the three child outcomes. The rating is based on child's functioning across settings and situations. A child's functioning is compared with what is expected for a child at that age. The rating reflects the child's functioning at each of the time points and should be determined as close to the actual entry and exit as possible. The comparison of entry to exit ratings provides information about the child's progress. Ratings on all three outcomes must be reported for *every* child enrolled. Ratings are needed in *all* areas even if: 1) No one has concerns about a child's development, and 2) A child has delays in one or two outcome areas, but not in all three outcome areas. The ECO Decision Tree is a helpful tool for facilitating the rating process and guides the team through the process for each outcome.
- Completes the COS forms upon **program entry and exit.** The COS process is completed at two points in time, at a minimum--when the child enters the program and when the child exits the program.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	80.00%	82.00%
Data		78.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	90.00%	90.00%	89.00%	89.00%	90.25%	90.65%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	84.00%	86.00%
Data	90.07%	91.34%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	88.00%	90.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
360	390	91.34%	88.00%	92.31%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	40.75%	957.00
-------------------------------------------------------------	--------	--------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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

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

For preschoolers with disabilities, 84 surveys were disseminated; of which, 47 completed surveys were returned, representing 55.95%% (47/84) parents of preschoolers with disabilities.

Was sampling used? No

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Was a survey used?  Yes

Is it a new or revised survey?  No

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

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

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

FFY 2017 Indicator 8 data represent the demographics of the CNMI. In the CNMI, the majority of children with IEPs are Pacific Islanders, consistent with the overall demographics of the population. Representation of the completed surveys is examined through the percentage of surveys returned from each island within the CNMI, inclusive of parents of preschoolers with disabilities, and by school levels.

Overall, 957 surveys were disseminated; of which, 390 or 40.75% surveys were returned. The CNMI is confident that the surveys represent the demographics of the CNMI.

The return rate by school levels included:

- Preschool: 55.95% (47/84)
- Elementary: 38.40% (144/375)
- Middle: 30.25% (49/162)
- High: 44.64% (150/336)

The FFY 2017 breakdown of surveys returned from each CNMI island included:

Elementary, Middle and High Schools:

- Saipan: 258 of 390 surveys returned or 66.15%
- Rota: 58 of 390 surveys returned or 14.87%
- Tinian: 27 of 390 surveys returned or 6.92%

Preschool:

- Saipan: 78.72% or 37 of 47 surveys returned
- Rota = 8.51% or 4 of 47 surveys returned
- Tinian = 8.51% or 4 of 47 surveys returned
- No Response 4.26% or 2 of 47 surveys returned

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**NOTE: CNMI selected the "YES" option for indicating that the parent respondents are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the CNMI.**

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

**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))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

**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))

This indicator is not applicable, as described above.

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

This indicator is not applicable, as described on the [Historical Data Page](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		53.00%	27.00%	48.00%	83.00%	87.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	94.17%	97.47%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	98.45%	97.96%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
225	223	97.96%	100%	99.11%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	2
-------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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.

Two (2) evaluations were conducted over the 60 day timeline. The range of days over was 5 to 140 days. Although the evaluations were conducted over the timeline, all were completed. One (1) student was determined eligible for services, the other was not eligible. A file review of the evaluations conducted over the timeline, as described on the Reason for Delay form, indicate non-adherence to referral procedures. The student with over 140 days was determined not eligible for services in Private School

School:  
RHI: 1 Non-adherence of Procedure (Eligible)  
Private School: 1 Non-adherence of Procedure (Not Eligible)  
Total: 2

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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, 2017 to June 30, 2018. The Data Manager logs the referral information into the database which generates the time requirements (60 days from receipt of the parent consent). The Data Manager sends out the referral information to the schools and providers responsible for the evaluation. Upon completion of evaluations, the reports are sent to the data manager to input into the database. The database is formatted to "flag" any dates over the 60-day timeline. For all red flags, a *Reason for Delay* form is required. The Data Manager, in consultation with the Special Education Director and Compliance Monitor, designates a determination of valid or invalid reasons for delay, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(d).

### Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

### FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As documented in the FFY 2016 performance data for Indicator 11, four (4) initial evaluations from (4) 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. Through a review of subsequent data of actual initial evaluations, these schools were verified corrected and received a *Written Notice of Timely Correction*.

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

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		96.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96.30%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	30
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	5
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	25
d. Number of children 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.	0
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	25	25	100%	100%	100%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	0
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

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

- State monitoring
- 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 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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						77.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
266	266	100%	100%	100%

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

Secondary teachers review IEP files of 16 year olds and older and fill in google survey per student. The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) checklist is included in the survey with additional questions. The survey results verified by the Data Manager to ensure the surveys reflect students who are at least 16 years old and above and that there were no duplicate counts. A random selection of IEP files are reviewed by the data manager to ensure accuracy of the survey results.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%
		Data						10.00%	17.00%	16.00%	24.00%	24.00%	25.45%
B	2009	Target ≥							62.00%	62.00%	62.00%	48.00%	52.00%
		Data						62.00%	45.00%	42.00%	67.00%	48.00%	47.27%
C	2009	Target ≥							86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	56.00%	63.00%
		Data						86.00%	66.00%	65.00%	82.00%	56.00%	50.91%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	16.00%	18.00%
	Data	16.98%	10.17%
B	Target ≥	55.00%	58.00%
	Data	37.74%	61.02%
C	Target ≥	69.00%	75.00%
	Data	43.40%	64.41%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	19.00%	20.00%
Target B ≥	61.00%	63.00%
Target C ≥	81.00%	87.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2017 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	49.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	6.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	18.00
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)	6.00
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).	0.00

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	6.00	49.00	10.17%	19.00%	12.24%

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	24.00	49.00	61.02%	61.00%	48.98%
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)	30.00	49.00	64.41%	81.00%	61.22%

### 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.

Option 2: 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.

### Reasons for B Slippage

CNMI did not meet its FFY 2017 target of 61% for Indicator 14B. CNMI's Indicator 14B performance of 48.98% (24/49) represented slippage from 61.02% (36/59) in FFY 2016; a decrease in percentage by 12.04%. By numbers, there was a difference of 12 leavers from 36 in FFY 2016 to 24 in FFY 2017.

In FFY 2016, there was a total of 72 exiters reported in CNMI's 618 Exit Data: 55 graduating with a high school diploma and 17 dropping out of high school. In FFY 2017, 10 of the drop-outs returned to high school, which left a total of 62 exiters considered "leavers" for the purpose of completing the post-school outcomes survey for Indicator 14.

The FFY 2017 Indicator 14 response rate was 79.03% (49/62), which included 46 graduates with a high school diploma and three (3) drop-outs. The 24 leavers accounted for in Indicator 14B were the exiters who graduated with a high school diploma: Six in higher education and 18 in competitive employment.

A review of the leaver respondents was conducted to determine the possible reasons for slippage in 14B. Of the three drop-outs surveyed, two were accounted for under "other training" and one was reported "not engaged." The remaining leaver respondents who graduated with a high school diploma not accounted for in 14B included 22: Four in "other training" and 18 "not engaged."

A closer look at the surveys completed by the "not engaged" leaver respondents reported that some stayed at home to help out the family, one quit a job shortly after starting but continued to look for a job, and others were looking for a job within the one year of leaving high school. As a follow-up, recent communication with most of these "not-engaged" leaver respondents reported that three of the leavers started working during the post-Super Typhoon Yutu period and one leaver left island to pursue post-secondary education.

### Reasons for C Slippage

CNMI did not meet its FFY 2017 target of 81% for Indicator 14C. CNMI's Indicator 14C performance of 61.22% (30/49) demonstrated slippage by 3.19% from 64.41% (38/59) in FFY 2016. By numbers, there was a difference of eight (8) leavers from 38 in FFY 2016 to 30 in FFY 2017.

In FFY 2016, there was a total of 72 exiters reported in CNMI's 618 Exit Data: 55 graduating with a high school diploma and 17 dropping out of high school. In FFY 2017, 10 of the drop-outs returned to high school, which left a total of 62 exiters considered "leavers" for the purpose of completing the post-school outcomes survey for Indicator 14.

The FFY 2017 Indicator 14 response rate was 79.03% (49/62), which included 46 graduates with a high school diploma and three (3) drop-outs. The 30 leavers accounted for in Indicator 14C were the 28 exiters who graduated with a high school diploma (six in higher education, 18 competitive employment, and four in other training) and two who dropped out from high school (both in other training).

A review of the leaver respondents was conducted to determine the possible reasons for slippage in 14C. Of the three drop-outs surveyed, two were accounted for under "other training" and one was reported "not engaged." The remaining leaver respondents who graduated with a high school diploma not accounted for in 14C were 18 "not engaged."

A closer look at the surveys completed by the "not engaged" leaver respondents reported that some stayed at home to help out the family, one quit a job shortly after starting but continued to look for a job, and others were looking for a job within the one year of leaving high school. As a follow-up, recent communication with most of these "not-engaged" leaver respondents reported that three of the leavers started working during the post-Super Typhoon Yutu period and one leaver left island to pursue post-secondary education.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

### 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.

In FFY 2016, there was a total of 72 exiters reported in CNMI's 618 Exit Data: 55 graduating with a high school diploma and 17 dropping out of high school. In FFY 2017, 10 of the drop-outs returned to high school, which left a total of 62 exiters considered "leavers" for the purpose of completing the post-school outcomes survey for Indicator 14.

For FFY 2017, CNMI reports a 79.03% (49/62) response rate for Indicator 14. CNMI also reports that its Indicator 14 leaver respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school.

CNMI's analysis of Indicator 14 response rate representation included a review of the 62 leavers: 55 who graduated with a high school diploma and 7 who dropped out of high school. Forty-nine (49) of the 62 leavers responded to the post-school outcomes survey. The 49 respondents represented the following:

**Exit Categories:** 83.63% (46/55) who graduated with a high school diploma completed the survey, and 17.64% (3/7) completed the survey.

**Ethnicity:** Based on the IDEA ethnicity categories of the leavers, the respondents represented 82.05% (32/39) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 71.42% (10/14) Asians, and 77.77% (7/9) two or more races.

**Gender:** The respondents represented 76.74% (33/43) of the leavers who were identified as male and 84.21% (16/19) of leavers who were identified as female.

**Disability:** The majority of leavers were identified as having a Specific Learning Disability (SLD) at 53.22% (33/62). The respondents therefore represented the majority SLD disability category at 57.14% (28/49); a similar percentage to the overall leaver SLD disability representation. Further, there were six other disability categories represented as leavers: HI, ID, MD, OHI, ED, and AUT, representing 46.77% (29/62) of the leavers. All six "other" disability categories were represented as respondents at 42.85% (21/49), which represented 21 of the 29 leavers with an "other" disability category.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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)

NOTE: CNMI selected the "YES" option for indicating that the response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data		

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 16: Mediation**

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)))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data		

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥		

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
0	0	0			

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		21.00%	29.00%	37.00%	46.00%
Data	14.00%	0%	0%	1.96%	7.69%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target ≥	55.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

The CNMI State identified Measurable Target, SiMR is:

By June 30, 2019, at least 55% of 3rd grade students with IEPs in three target schools will perform at or above reading proficiency against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards as measured by the state assessment. The Target for school year 2017-2018 is 46 % of the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in the target schools will meet reading proficiency. The 2017-2018 assessment data indicate that 7.69% of students in 3rd grade in the target schools met reading proficiency. Therefore, the CNMI did not meet its target.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input** - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Overview**

Please see the attached [CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Year 3 \(SSIP\)](#)

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

See attached document.

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see the attached [CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Year 3 \(SSIP\)](#).

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

*Statement*

Please see the attached [CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Year 2 \(SSIP\)](#).

*Description*

Please see the attached [CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Year 3 \(SSIP\)](#).

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please see the attached [CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Year 3 \(SSIP\)](#)

**Theory of Action**

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

*Description of Illustration*

Please see the attached [CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase III Year 3 \(SSIP\)](#) for the Theory of Action and graphic

**Infrastructure Development**

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

**Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices**

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

**Evaluation**

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

# FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please see attached [CNMI IDEA Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan \(SSIP\) Phase III Year 3](#).

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please see attached [CNMI IDEA Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan \(SSIP\) Phase III Year 3](#).

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please see attached [CNMI IDEA Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan \(SSIP\) Phase III Year 3](#).

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please see attached [CNMI IDEA Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan \(SSIP\) Phase III Year 3](#).

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

Please see attached [CNMI IDEA Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan \(SSIP\) Phase III Year 3](#).

### F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please see attached [CNMI IDEA Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan \(SSIP\) Phase III Year 3](#).

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

**Selected:** 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: Glenn Muna

Title: Commissioner of Education

Email: glenn.muna@cnmipss.org

Phone: 670-237-3061