

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

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

The CNMI is a unitary educational system responsible for the implementation and supervision of special education and related services to children 3 through 21 years old in 21 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.

Technical Assistance System:

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

Response to OSEP FFY 2012 Part B APR Determination Letter, June 23, 2014:

The CNMI provides the following information to meet the Secretary's reporting requirements for its longstanding non compliance stated in the June 23, 2014 FFY 2012 Part B Determination Letter and Compliance Data Summary:

(1) Longstanding Noncompliance: Special Conditions imposed on all grants awarded to the CNMI

- a. Technical assistance received: CNMI continues to work with the Department's Risk Management Service (RMS) to address CNMI's Public School System Special Conditions.
- b. Actions taken as a result of the RMS technical assistance: CNMI provides quarterly reports to RMS demonstrating progress towards addressing the Special Conditions.

Technical Assistance System:

The PSS has a technical assistance system and mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based support provided to the schools. In the past few years, the PSS implemented several school level system wide initiatives that are intended to improve results for all students such as *Classroom Instruction That Works*, *Universal Design for Learning*, *Understanding by Design*, *Response to Intervention*, *Success in Sight*, *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)* and *Positive Behavioral Intervention Support Systems*. Principals are also required to conduct *Power Walk Through* for each teacher several times per year. The data derived from *Power Walk Through* show the level of instruction and student engagement, at the time of the observation. *Power Walk Through* data are discussed with each teacher to determine how or what the teacher must do to increase higher order thinking and improve overall instructional practices. The PSS has also implemented, in collaboration and partnership with AdvancED, a Teacher and Principal Evaluation System, and recently completed a system-wide accreditation with a district-wide on-site visit from AdvancED staff in October 2013. This state-wide accreditation process assisted the PSS to determine its effectiveness as a school system in preparing all students for college and careers, and allow for a systematic way for PSS to identify areas of strengths and opportunities for improvement. Follow up training and school level visits have continued around the initiatives in the drive to improve student performance on state-level assessments.

Technical assistance and professional development are provided to special education and related service staff on a regular basis through the monthly meetings with the Special Education Director and Compliance Monitor. The TA varies depending on the level of support needed by individual school teams. A recent decision to separate the Secondary teachers meeting from the elementary teachers was a result of specific needs for staff of that age group.

PSS also accesses and benefits from Technical Assistance provided by OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources, such as the RRC's, DaSy Center, IDC, ECTAC, NPSO, and Regional Centers, such as University of Guam CEDDERS.

Professional Development System:

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

The PSS has in place a system of professional development to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve the results of students with disabilities. All PSS staff are required 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 programs level needs. Over the past few years, program level needs include training specific to discipline procedures and positive behavioral interventions for general education and special education teachers, school counselors, and/or other personnel responsible for the implementation of discipline procedures, the Core Content Connectors for students with significant cognitive disabilities who take an alternate assessment, training for early childhood special education staff, Head Start staff and parents on instructional strategies and practices that are research and evidenced based to improve the outcomes for children, training for EI staff, early childhood special education staff, Head Start staff and K to third grade teachers on:

- The P-3 Comprehensive Services and Support Plan
- The Early Learning Guidelines
- The revised Head Start Curriculum framework
- The Transition Process

Monthly meetings with the Compliance Monitor and SPED Director are conducted with Special Education Teachers, Related Service Providers, and school administrators. The agenda varies but often includes items related to the referral process, evaluations and re-evaluation processes and procedures, common core standards, Understanding by Design, Response to Interventions, Learning Outcomes, and Meaningful Engagement in General Education.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

With Technical Assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program (IDEA Part B) facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input in the development of the FFY 2013 SPP targets. Primary stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The review process included a series meetings and work sessions to review and discuss OSEP's CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table and current performance data for each indicator. Setting the targets, the stakeholders reviewed the indicator trend data over several years and determined an effective strategy to use to set new targets for the indicators based on the previous performance. The stakeholders considered several processes to set the targets. Some of the considerations were to average out the performance data over several years and increase or decrease the target by percentage points; to stagger the increases for several years; or use a continuous increase process. SESAP set the end targets for 2018 above the baseline data. SESAP's final review of the SPP and APR was in late December. On January 16, 2015 the SPP/ APR was discussed with the Fiscal, Personnel and Budget subcommittee of the Board of Education and on January 27, 2015, the Commissioner of Education presented the final SPP/APR to the Board of Education for approval.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 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 2012 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 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The CNMI will annually report to the public as soon as practicable but no later than 120 days following the submission of the APR the targets in 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 <http://www.cnmipss.org/special-education/>.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		69.00%	75.00%	75.00%	81.00%	84.00%	87.00%	93.00%
Data	81.30%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	71.00%	59.00%	78.00%	71.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%	78.00%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. The primary stakeholders are the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP). Additional stakeholders include school level administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP’s CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 1, the stakeholders averaged the performance of the last 5 years and staggered the targets to ensure the 2018 target is greater than the baseline.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
		Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma		45
		Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate		62
		2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table		Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

As an outlying area, CNMI does not report graduation data to the Department under ESEA Title 1. The CNMI used required

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

credits for senior status at the beginning of the school year to determine the number of seniors with IEPs.

In school year 2005-2006, the Board of Education (BOE) Policy 60-20-434: *Graduation Requirements* was revised 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 apply also to students with disabilities.

Explanation of Data Discrepancy

Please explain why the calculated total does not match the adjusted cohort graduation rate reported to the CSPR.

Not applicable to the CNMI.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
45	62	71.00%	72.00%	72.58%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.00%	4.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP's CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 2, the stakeholders decreased the percentage by 1% and staggered the targets to end with 2% drop out rate.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
6	243	5.00%	4.00%	2.47%

Use a different calculation methodology

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

As an outlying area, CNMI does not report dropout data used in ESEA graduation rate calculation to the Department under

ESEA Title 1. CNMI uses an event rate of calculating dropout data; the incidence of students who drop out in a single year without completing high school compared to the student enrollment in grades 9-12 for that school year (618 exit data and high school enrollment).

Definition of Dropout: The CNMI PSS 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 not known 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.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? Yes No

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AYP	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1					

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

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. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	92.00%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	92.00%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP’s CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 3B, the stakeholders increased the percentage of participation by .5 to end with a participation rate of 95.5%, which represents a 17.5% increase from the baseline rate for Reading and 10.5% increase for Math from the baseline.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
------------	------------------------------	--	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	476	440	95.00%	92.00%	92.44%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	476	440	95.00%	92.00%	92.44%

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: <http://www.cnmipss.org/special-education/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

CNMI submits its data for Indicator 3B as an attachment. As described in the attachment, the GRADS 360 prepopulated data did not include all students with IEPs who participated in the statewide assessment. The GRADS 360 prepopulated data did not have the revised population data. The attached Indicator 3B data are CNMI's valid and reliable data, consistent with CNMI's 618 reported data for assessment.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

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. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	20.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%	60.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	20.00%	20.00%	30.00%	40.00%	50.00%	60.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP’s CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 3C, the stakeholders increased the percentage of proficiency by 10% to end with a proficiency rate of 60%, which represents a 49% increase from the baseline established in 2005 Reading and 50% increase in Math.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	440	95	8.00%	20.00%	21.59%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	440	103	8.00%	20.00%	23.41%

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: <http://www.cnmipss.org/special-education/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

CNMI submits the **attached proficiency data for CNMI's IDEA Part B FFY 2013 APR, Indicator 3C**. The GRADS 360 prepopulated data did not include all the students with IEPs that received a valid proficient score. CNMI counts scores in the average and above average levels. The GRADS 360 prepopulated data excluded the "average" level scores. Also, the GRADS 360 prepopulated data did not have the revised population and proficiency data. The attached proficiency data are CNMI's valid and reliable data for Indicator 3C, consistent with CNMI's 618 reported data for assessment.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP's CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 4, the CNMI submitted its Significant Discrepancy Definition in FFY 2008 of "0" difference between the two groups, students with and without disabilities. The targets based on the Significant Discrepancy will remain at "zero" or nothing above 1%. The CNMI maintained 0% significant discrepancy for its targets, but as described in the FFY 2013 data, with stakeholder input, changed its definition of significant discrepancy.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	1	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

- 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 2012

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target						

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
		1			

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

- 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).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 5: Education 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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		68.00%	70.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%
		Data	68.00%	74.00%	74.00%	75.40%	82.70%	84.80%	88.00%	88.00%
B	2005	Target ≤		5.40%	5.30%	5.30%	5.20%	5.20%	5.20%	5.20%
		Data	10.00%	8.00%	8.00%	3.40%	1.80%	2.10%	1.20%	1.50%
C	2005	Target ≤		1.00%	0.90%	0.90%	0%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%
		Data	1.00%	0.14%	0.14%	0.27%	0.25%	0.20%	0.30%	0.20%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%
Target B ≤	5.00%	4.80%	4.60%	4.40%	4.20%	4.00%
Target C ≤	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%	0.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP's CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For 5A, the stakeholders discussed the data, the outcomes of the learning, how the LRE placement impacts student achievement, and what the levels of support are provided to students with disabilities in General Education. The stakeholders agreed that the performance in 5A is adequate, therefore the remaining targets were set to end with 85%, which is higher than the baseline. For 5B, the stakeholders decreased the targets by a tenth of a percent to end with 4%.

Prepopulated Data

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	819	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	746	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	0	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	0	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	2	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	746	819	88.00%	80.00%	91.09%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15	819	1.50%	5.00%	1.83%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	2	819	0.20%	0.70%	0.24%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								86.00%
		Data							85.00%	76.00%
B	2011	Target ≤								0%
		Data							0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%
Target B ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP's CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 6A and B, stakeholders discussed the current performance and trend data for students with IEPs in regular early childhood education programs, IEP team considerations for the least restrictive environment that include attending a preschool school close to home that the child would attend if the child did not have a disability and the levels of support for students with disabilities in the Early childhood settings. The stakeholders agreed to increase the performance target by 2% every year to end with 86% in regular early childhood programs.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	87	

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	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	69	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	0	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	69	87	76.00%	76.00%	79.31%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	87	0%	0%	0%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					96.00%	96.50%	96.50%	96.50%
		Data				96.00%	100%	82.90%	95.00%	86.00%
A2	2008	Target ≥					42.00%	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%
		Data				37.00%	33.00%	53.80%	47.00%	52.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥					100%	100%	100%	100%
		Data				100%	95.00%	87.20%	84.00%	89.00%
B2	2008	Target ≥					27.00%	54.00%	54.00%	54.00%
		Data				22.00%	38.00%	43.60%	33.00%	30.00%
C1	2008	Target ≥					96.00%	96.50%	96.50%	96.50%
		Data				96.20%	90.00%	81.30%	91.00%	90.00%
C2	2008	Target ≥					49.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%
		Data				44.40%	48.00%	59.00%	67.00%	63.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	90.00%	91.50%	92.50%	93.50%	95.00%	96.50%
Target A2 ≥	47.00%	49.00%	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%
Target B1 ≥	90.00%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	98.00%	100%
Target B2 ≥	29.00%	29.00%	30.00%	30.00%	31.00%	31.00%
Target C1 ≥	86.50%	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%	96.50%
Target C2 ≥	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%	71.50%	72.00%	72.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP's CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to

expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 7, the stakeholders engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding the intent of Child Outcome Measurements, how the data is collected and reported, and the variables that impact Child Outcomes. Setting targets for this indicator was challenging due to the high performance in several Outcomes in the baseline year and the low “n” size of children exiting. The targets were set and the 2018 target is higher than the baseline data.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	31
--	----

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	12
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	7
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	10

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	19	21	86.00%	90.00%	90.48%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	17	31	52.00%	47.00%	54.84%

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

	Number 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	22
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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 years of	31	31	89.00%	90.00%	100%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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)	9	31	30.00%	29.00%	29.03%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number 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	3
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	6
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	14
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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)	20	23	90.00%	86.50%	86.96%
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)	22	31	63.00%	70.50%	70.97%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

CNMI must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The CNMI provided progress data and target data for FFY 2013 in all Outcome Measurements in the previous section of this indicator as required in the FFY 2012 response table.

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? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	78.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	90.00%	90.00%	89.00%	89.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP’s CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training, current PSS initiatives, how much change is challenging yet realistic to expect and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 8, the stakeholders gradually increased the percentage by 2% each year with an end target of 90%, which is higher than the baseline data.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
426	472	89.00%	80.00%	90.25%

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 are disseminated to all students including the preschool children. The surveys include an introductory letter and a blank envelope to use when returning the completed surveys. The schools collect and compile the surveys and submit the sealed envelopes to Special Education Central Office, Data Manager. The surveys are sent to the University of Guam CEDDERS for analysis of the data. 82 surveys were disseminated to the Early Childhood families. Of the 82 that went out, 38 were returned representing a 46% return rate for the preschool children on all three Islands.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

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. For Saipan, the largest island in the CNMI, 794 surveys were disseminated; of which, 405 or 51% were returned. For the island of Rota 50 surveys were disseminated and 38 or 76% were returned. For the island of Tinian, 34 surveys were disseminated of which, 29 or 85% were returned. Overall, the return rate was 54%. Therefore, CNMI Indicator 8 data are representative of the children with IEPs on the 3 islands within CNMI.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations



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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data								

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
		1		0%	

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations



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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data								

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
		1		0%	

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	53.00%	27.00%	48.00%	83.00%	87.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
120	113	98.00%	100%	94.17%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	7
---	---

Explanation of Slippage

The CNMI Performance was 94.17% (113/120). CNMI did not meet the compliance target of 100%, however, the CNMI has demonstrated significant progress in this indicator over the past several years from the 2005-2006 baseline data of 53%. Improvement activities that contributed to CNMI's significant progress included the development of standard operating procedures that describe who, how, and when referrals are sent to the central office and a visual flow chart of the steps and processes. Monthly statistical reports are provided to principals with referral and IEP data. The *Evaluation Report Form* was updated and reformatted to be more user friendly and includes all required documentation and timelines. A file review was conducted on the the evaluations that were untimely to determine the root cause of the delays. As a result of the review, an additional teacher was assigned to one school and a review of the referral and evaluation procedures and processes was conducted with the staff including the school leadership.

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

Seven evaluations were conducted over the 60 day timeline for invalid reasons. The range of days over was 3 to 126 days. Although the seven evaluations were late, all initial evaluations were completed. A file review indicated the primary reasons for the delays, as documented on the

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reason for Delay form, were non adherence to procedures. The noncompliance was limited to 4 schools, GTC (1) KHS (1) SSHS (2) WSR (3).

The table below indicates the number of delayed evaluations and reasons for the delay by school. For all evaluations conducted over the 60-day timeline, the school must submit a completed *Reason for the Delay* form which is verified by the Data Manager. The seven evaluations conducted over the timeline with invalid reasons for delay were due to non-adherence to procedures.

Number of Delays with Reasons by School

School	# Delayed Evaluations	Invalid Reason for Delay
GTC	1	Non-adherence to procedures
KHS	1	Non-adherence to procedures
SSHS	2	Non-adherence to procedures
WSR	3	Non-adherence to procedures
Total	7	

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.

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, 2013 to June 30, 2014. 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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In 2012-2013, three schools received a *Written Notice of Findings* for three individual instances of initial evaluations not completed within the 60-day timeline. Although late, all individual instances of noncompliance were verified to be completed. The three schools were verified corrected through a review of subsequent data of actual initial evaluation documents and the database within one year from the date of the notification and received a *Written Notice of Timely Correction*.

As shown in the table below, the three individual instances of noncompliance represented 7.8% (3/38) of the students with IEPs at the three schools:

Verification of Correction of Noncompliance for 2012-2013 Findings by Schools:

#	Schools	(a) FFY 2012 (2012-2013): % and # of Individual Instances of Noncompliance by Schools*	(b) # of Schools in (a) that demonstrated Timely Correction (i=Verified within 1 Year of Notice)
1.	KES	11.1% (1/9)	ü
2.	SVS	5.5% (1/18)	ü
3.	PRV	9.0% (1/11)	ü
		7.8% (3/38) Individual Instances of Noncompliance	3 Schools Verified Timely Correction

*All Individual Instances were late – completed over timeline.

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

The 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.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	27
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	9
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	17
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	1
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	17	17	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	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.

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					77.00%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
214	214	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.

FFY 2013 represented the fifth and final year of implementation for Cutting Edj data entry inputted by secondary teachers at the school level and reconciled with the special education data system. Along with verification via the special education data system, the special education monitor used the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) checklist to review IEP files for transition requirements at individual schools on an annual basis and has access to Cutting Edj. The Cutting Edj Data System reports on the secondary transition planning components of IEPs of students aged 15 and above. The system flags students aged 15 who should have transition planning in their IEPs as they will turn 16 within the term of the IEP. CNMI PSS contracted with Cutting Edj Consulting, Inc. to collect the data required to report on Indicator 13 secondary transition mandates. Cutting Edj uses the NSTTAC checklist as a rigorous, valid and reliable tool to assess performance in transition planning for postsecondary activities and translates the information into a “snapshot” complete with raw numbers and percentages per component. The Cutting Edj Data System then allows each school site, as well as the special education monitor, to view and review each of the eight items on the NSTTAC checklist and provide the necessary changes or additional input needed to bring individual files into compliance. The Cutting Edj data were then verified with the IEP data in the special education data system for APR reporting.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	12	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 2012, CNMI reported 100% compliance for Indicator 13 based on the special education data system. During the same reporting year, one high school received a *Written Notice of Findings* for twelve individual instances of noncompliance with the secondary transition requirements in the IEP. The findings were made as a result of the comprehensive on-site school monitoring conducted at the high school in April 2013.

CNMI verified correction of findings, either timely or subsequent correction, through a review of the required Indicator 13 requirements 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.

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

The twelve student-specific findings were corrected and verified by a file review for each student in May 2013, with subsequent data reviewed through the special education data system to verify adherence to the secondary transition mandates. A *Written Notice of Correction* was issued to the high school on February 14, 2014. The issuance of the *Written Notice of Correction* was within one year of the issuance of the *Notice of Findings*. With the individual child-specific noncompliance corrected immediately and verified in May 2013, CNMI was able to report 100% compliance for FFY 2012 Indicator 13 performance.

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						10.00%	10.00%	10.00%
		Data					10.00%	17.00%	16.00%	24.00%
B	2009	Target ≥						62.00%	62.00%	62.00%
		Data					62.00%	45.00%	42.00%	67.00%
C	2009	Target ≥						86.00%	86.00%	86.00%
		Data					86.00%	66.00%	65.00%	82.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	19.00%	20.00%
Target B ≥	48.00%	52.00%	55.00%	58.00%	61.00%	63.00%
Target C ≥	56.00%	63.00%	69.00%	75.00%	81.00%	87.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The CNMI Public School System (PSS), Special Education Program, with technical assistance provided by the University of Guam CEDDERS, facilitated several input sessions with stakeholders in order to set new SPP targets for 2013 through 2018. Stakeholders included the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP), school administrators, program managers, special education teachers, related service personnel and early childhood special education personnel. The input sessions included a discussion of OSEP’s CNMI Part B Determination Letter issued on June 23, 2014, the compliance matrix, the response table, and the current performance data. The discussion also included the need to establish new targets for FFY 2013 through 2018.

Stakeholders discussed current performance, trend data over several years, performance slippage, policy or procedural changes, professional development and training for secondary teachers, building and sustaining connections with outside agencies and businesses, and what activities might have the biggest impact or effect the proposed targets. The stakeholders also discussed how targets are typically set using continuous, staggered or slight improvement considerations.

For Indicator 14, the stakeholders averaged the performance of the last 5 years and staggered the targets to ensure the 2018 target is greater than the baseline.

FFY 2013 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	50
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	12
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	12
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)	3
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).	1

	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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	12	50	24.00%	12.00%	24.00%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	24	50	67.00%	48.00%	48.00%
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)	28	50	82.00%	56.00%	56.00%

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	0	

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

--

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.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	14.00%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	21.00%	29.00%	37.00%	46.00%	55.00%

Description of Measure

CNMI will be measuring reading proficiency against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards, as measured by the state assessment, for 3rd graders with IEPs in three target schools.

Please refer to **Pages 30-32** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase I (SSIP), Component #3: *State Identified Measurable Results* for further description.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please refer to **Pages 1-2** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase I (SSIP), *Introduction and Stakeholder Involvement*.

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.

Please refer to **Pages 3-9** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase I (SSIP), Component #1: *Data Analysis*.

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 refer to **Pages 10-29** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase I (SSIP), Component #2: *Infrastructure Analysis*.

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 refer to **Pages 30-32** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), Component #3: *State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR)*.

Description

Please refer to **Page 30-32** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase I (SSIP), Component #3: *State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR)*.

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 refer to **Pages 33-37** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase I (SSIP); Component #4: *Coherent Improvement Strategies*.

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: [Theory of Action Graphic](#)

Illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Please refer to **Page 38** of the attached CNMI State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase I (SSIP), Component #5: *Theory of*

Action Description and Graphic.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.