

# MP Part C

# FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

**Executive Summary:**

The CNMI Public School System (PSS) is a unitary educational system responsible for the provision and supervision of early intervention service and support for infants and toddlers with disabilities on three populated islands. PSS is the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation, supervision, and monitoring of the Early Intervention Program (IDEA Part C). The Commissioner of Education (COE) is the PSS Chief State School Officer responsible for administering the IDEA Part C.

This Executive Summary includes a description of CNMI's IDEA Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2015. A description of the CNMI's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement in the development and review of the SPP and APR and how the CNMI will report the SPP and APR to the Public are provided separately within this Introduction section of CNMI's FFY 2015 APR.

In FFY 2013, the CNMI stakeholders determined targets for Results Indicators through FFY 2018. For FFY 2015 APR, the Early Intervention program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder involvement in the development of the CNMI IDEA Part C FFY 2015-2016 Annual Performance Report (APR). Stakeholders included the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), early intervention staff and the Board of Education.

The review process included a discussion of OSEP's CNMI Part C determination letter issued on June 2016, the RDA Matrix, HTDMD document, the 2016 Data Rubric Part C, the Dispute Resolution 2014-2015 and a Data Display. With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the stakeholders reviewed the performance data, trend data for the past 2 years, national data for each indicator, and engaged in a discussion of each indicator's progress or slippage.

This FFY 2015 APR includes current performance data on 9 of the 11 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2015 data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2015 target, an explanation of slippage if CNMI did not meet its target, and a response to any issue identified for the Indicator in the 2016 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2014 SPP/APR. Although CNMI did not meet all its results targets in FFY 2015, the stakeholders agreed not to revise the Results targets at this time.

As required, for Indicator 11, CNMI's Part C State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), CNMI will submit its SSIP Phase III, including a description of CNMI's midcourse changes or modification in the Implementation and Evaluation Plans, no later than April 3, 2017.

**Required Response for FFY 2014 "Needs Assistance" Determination:**

As stated in the June 28, 2016 FFY 2014 Part C Determination Letter and Compliance Data Summary, the CNMI continues to provide the following information to meet the Secretary's reporting requirements for its longstanding noncompliance:

1. Longstanding Noncompliance related to CNMI's Department-wide Special Conditions imposed on the CNMI's last four IDEA Part C grants
2. Access technical assistance related to CNMI's Department-wide Special Conditions and status as a high risk grantee through the US DOE Department's Risk Management Service
3. CNMI must implement the Special Condition set out in the Department's FFY2016 Department-wide Special Condition's Letter.

**Required Response for FFY 2015 "Needs Assistance" Determination:**

As required, CNMI provides the following information to meet the Secretary's reporting requirements for its longstanding non-compliance stated in the June 28, 2016 FFY 2014 Part B Determination Letter and Compliance Data Summary:

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

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.
2. Actions taken as a result of the RMS technical assistance: CNMI provides quarterly reports to RMS demonstrating progress towards addressing the Special Conditions.

As stipulated in the special conditions, the CNMI has completed and submitted timely audits over the past 5 years and will be considered a low risk auditee this year. The CNMI also posts all required documents on the PSS Website.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">apr cert. 1-23-17.pdf</a>	Robin Palacios		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e

**General Supervision System:**

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

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

The CNMI monitoring system is a continuous and ongoing process that encompasses several components that serves a different function. The monitoring components include the “database,” file reviews, the annual performance reports, self assessments, quality assurance reports, parent forums, and parent surveys and a “drill down process”. When noncompliance is found, either through the database, file reviews or another component, every effort is made to correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year. When corrections are made, the correction is verified and that area is monitored several times during the report year to demonstrate continued correction. For noncompliance in a time sensitive process, the activity is completed immediately and the “root cause” is discussed to determine if there continues to be systemic issues or an individual provider issue. When corrections are made, the correction is verified and that area is monitored several times during the reporting year to demonstrate continued correction. The Monitoring Procedures, updated in May 2011, includes OSEP’s Memorandum 09-02 on timely correction of noncompliance, a definition of a “Finding,” a description of sanctions that are in line with PSS Disciplinary Procedures, the timelines and responsible party for the issuance of “*Notice of Findings* and/or *Notice of Failure to Correct*” from the Commissioner of Education, the monitoring responsibilities of the external monitor, and revisions to the file review checklist. CNMI PSS also has in place policies and procedures, consistent with IDEA 2004 regulations, to resolve complaints including procedures to resolve complaints through dispute resolution session settlements and mediation agreements.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Technical Assistance System:**

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

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

The PSS also accesses and benefits from universal technical assistance provided by OSEP and OSEP-funded TA Centers and Resources, either through publications, guidance tools, resource materials, monthly conference calls and webinars specially on the Early Childhood Family Coaching, or in person on site assistance through Pacific Learning Collaborates or other venues. TA such as the IDEA Data Center for evaluating the SSIP plans and high quality data use, the DaSy Center for the collection and analysis of the Early Intervention and Special Education 619 data, the ECTA Center and NCSI for the improvement of Child Outcome Data, the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting to assist with fiscal data collection and reporting requirements.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Professional Development System:**

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

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

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

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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

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

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

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

The review process included the following stakeholder input for the 2015-2016 SPP/APR development:

- August 2016: OSEP's Part C Determination Letter issued June 28, 2016, compliance matrix, and current performance data for each indicator were disseminated to the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and Early Intervention Providers (Core SSIP Team) reviewed all Indicator targets and performance.
- August 2016: The Part C Interim Coordinator presented Part C SSIP at Public School System Summer Institute with Principal and Program Managers in attendance.
- November 2016: The ICC reviewed all indicator targets and performance with comparison to National Data. In addition, the ICC discussed and reviewed additional data presented on Indicators that displayed slippage to determine reasons "why" the Program did not meet the target. ICC members provided input on recommendations during the meeting.
- December 2016: Executive Summary was presented to the Commissioner of Education.
- December 2016: The Instructional Service and Assessment Subcommittee endorsed the Part C FFY 2015 APR and the Board of Education adopted the FFY 2015 Part C APR.
- January 2017: the ICC approved and certified the FFY 2015 APR.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
7/31/2017		

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

No APR attachments found.

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each EIS Program or Provider 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 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(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 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

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

<http://www.cnmipss.org/early-intervention/>

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

### OSEP Response

The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' (CNMI) determinations for both 2015 and 2016 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2016 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

The CNMI's FFY 2016 IDEA Part C grant is on Department-wide special conditions and has been since 2004.

### Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2016 and 2017 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2017 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2018, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

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

**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		98.00%	100%	96.00%	98.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
81	81	100%	100%	100%

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

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

0

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

Timely Service Data reported for the period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 is taken from the database of the total count. Services include initial and any other services added to the IFSP during the report period.

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

The process used to collect the timely service start dates and monthly services dates is the Initial Start Date Form that is prepared by Early Intervention (EI) providers, signed by

parents and submitted to the data manager. The form indicates the service, the agreed upon start date as is written on the IFSP, a revised start date if necessary, with an explanation based on the family's request, and the parent signature.

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

**CNMI Definition of Timely Services:**

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

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**Data Collection and Verification:**

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

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response 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 2014**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			96.75%	97.00%	97.25%	97.50%	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%
Data		95.00%	95.00%	98.00%	96.30%	94.00%	96.00%	97.50%	98.30%	98.67%	96.25%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	96.00%	96.00%	96.00%	96.50%

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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	51	
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	53	

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
51	53	96.25%	96.00%	96.23%

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						76.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	50.00%	55.00%
		Data					75.00%	44.00%	58.30%	58.80%	81.30%	50.00%	85.71%
A2	2008	Target ≥						64.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%
		Data					64.00%	52.00%	52.90%	43.50%	59.10%	77.78%	82.76%
B1	2008	Target ≥						54.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	65.00%	66.00%
		Data					54.20%	61.00%	64.70%	72.70%	72.70%	81.25%	75.00%
B2	2008	Target ≥						32.00%	33.00%	33.00%	33.00%	50.00%	51.00%
		Data					32.00%	40.00%	35.30%	34.80%	36.40%	66.67%	58.62%
C1	2008	Target ≥						82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
		Data					81.80%	83.00%	72.70%	90.00%	64.30%	92.31%	93.33%
C2	2008	Target ≥						76.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	61.00%	65.00%
		Data					76.00%	68.00%	52.90%	60.90%	55.00%	61.11%	82.76%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	60.00%	65.00%	70.00%	75.10%
Target A2 ≥	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%	66.00%
Target B1 ≥	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
Target B2 ≥	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%
Target C1 ≥	82.50%	82.50%	83.00%	83.00%
Target C2 ≥	69.00%	73.00%	75.00%	77.00%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	52.00
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	12.00	23.08%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	5.00	9.62%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3.00	5.77%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	32.00	61.54%

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	8.00	20.00	85.71%	60.00%	40.00%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	35.00	52.00	82.76%	66.00%	67.31%

**Explanation of A1 Slippage**

CNMI Part C service providers actively engages families in gathering information through multiple sources of information to determine the overall rating of each outcome. The Part C program used multiple sources of information to assess each child's performance for each outcome to include but not limited to the parent interviews, observations, evaluation reports, and Hawaii Early Learning Profile.

Of the 52 infants and toddlers that exited this reporting period, 12 or 23.1% in progress category “b” showed that they had improved in their functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to function comparable to same age peers in positive social emotional development. Five or 9.6% were in progress category “c” that showed that they had improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. The remaining infants and toddlers (35) reached or maintained functioning compared to their same aged peers. There were no infants or toddlers that did not improve functioning.

CNMI did not meet the target for Outcome A1 with a slippage of 46% for FFY 2014 to a performance of 40% for FFY 2015. Further data analysis on the length of service, age at entry, and disability criteria data to determine possible reasons for the slippage. Of children in progress categories b, 5 out of the 12 or 42% of infants and toddlers had received less than 1 year of early intervention services and 5 out the 12 or 42% of the children had less than 2 years of early intervention services. There were only two (2) children in the b progress category that had up to 3 years of early intervention services.

Further analysis on the age at entry for children in progress category “b” showed that 6 out of the 12 or 50% of the toddlers were between 12 to 24 months of age when they first entered and received early intervention services. Four out of the 12 or 33% were between the ages of 25 to 36 months when they first received early intervention services.

Nine of the 12 or 75% of the children in progress category “b” were eligible as established condition.

Stakeholders focused on the children in Category “b” because these are the children who improved functioning but not sufficient to their same age peers. Based on stakeholder input, the reason for the slippage may be attributed to the short time children had in accessing and receiving early intervention services. In addition, stakeholders discussed the low “n” size of children that participated in the ECO measurements. For FFY 2014, there were only 29 infants and toddlers that exited the program compared to the 52 infants and toddlers that exited in FFY 2015. Caution should be taken in interpreting the reasons for the slippage due to the low “n” size used in computing the slippages for this reporting period.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	22.00	42.31%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	10.00	19.23%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	9.00	17.31%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	11.00	21.15%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	19.00	41.00	75.00%	67.00%	46.34%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	20.00	52.00	58.62%	52.00%	38.46%

**Explanation of B1 Slippage**

CNMI Part C service providers actively engages families in gathering information through multiple sources of information to determine the overall rating of each outcome. The Part C program used multiple sources of information to assess each child's performance for each outcome to include but not limited to the parent interviews, observations, evaluation reports, and Hawaii Early Learning Profile.

Of the 52 infants and toddlers that exited this reporting period, 22 or 42.3% in progress category “b” showed that they had improved in their functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to function comparable to same age peers in acquisition of knowledge and skills. Ten or 19.2% were in progress category “c” that showed that they had improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. The remaining infants and toddlers (20) reached or maintained functioning compared to their same aged peers. There were no infants or toddlers that did not improve functioning.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

CNMI did not meet the target for Outcome B1 with a slippage of 28.7% for FFY 2014 to a performance of 46.34% for FFY 2015. Further data analysis on the length of service, age at entry, and disability criteria data to determine possible reasons for the slippage. Of children in progress categories b, 8 out of the 22 or 36% of infants and toddlers had received less than 1 year of early intervention services and 12 out the 22 or 54.5% of the children had less than 2 years of early intervention services. There were 5 children out the 22 in the "b" progress category that had up to 3 years of early intervention services.

Further analysis on the age at entry for children in progress category "b" showed that 10 out of the 22 or 45.45% of the toddlers were between 12 to 24 months of age when they first entered and received early intervention services. Four out of the 22 or 18.18% were between the ages of 25 to 36 months when they first received early intervention services.

Twelve of the 22 or 54.54% of the children in progress category "b" were eligible as established condition and 10 or 45.45% were eligible as developmental delay.

Stakeholders focused on the children in Category "b" because these are the children who improved functioning but not sufficient to their same age peers. Based on stakeholder input, the reason for the slippage may be attributed to the short time children had in accessing and receiving early intervention services. In addition, stakeholders discussed the low "n" size of children that participated in the ECO measurements. For FFY 2014, there were only 29 infants and toddlers that exited the program compared to the 52 infants and toddlers that exited in FFY 2015. Caution should be taken in interpreting the reasons for the slippage due to the low "n" size used in computing the slippages for this reporting period.

**Explanation of B2 Slippage**

Of the 52 infants and toddlers that exited this reporting period, 32 or 61.53% in progress categories "b and c" showed that they had improved in their functioning in acquisition of knowledge and skills. The remaining toddlers (20) reached or maintained functioning compared to their same aged peers. There were no infants or toddlers that did not improve functioning.

CNMI did not meet the target for Outcome B2 with a slippage of 20.16% for FFY 2014 to a performance of 38.46%. Further data analysis on the length of service, age at entry, and disability criteria data to determine possible reasons for the slippage of children in progress categories b and c, 11 or 34.37% had only 1 year of early intervention services and 14 or 43.75% of the children had only 2 years of early intervention services.

Further analysis on the age at entry for children in progress categories "b" and "c" showed that 14 out of the 32 or 43.75% of the toddlers were between 12 to 24 months of age when they first entered and received early intervention services. Eight (8) out of the 32 or 25% were between the ages of 25 to 36 months when they first received early intervention services.

Stakeholders focused on the children in Categories "b" and "c" because these are the children who improved functioning but not sufficient to their same age peers in the acquisition of knowledge and skills. Based on stakeholder input, the reason for the slippage may be attributed to the short time children had in accessing and receiving early intervention services. In addition, stakeholders discussed the low "n" size of children that participated in the ECO measurements. For FFY 2014, there were only 29 infants and toddlers that exited the program compared to the 52 infants and toddlers that exited in FFY 2015. Caution should be taken in interpreting the reasons for the slippage due to the low "n" size used in computing the slippages for this reporting period.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0.00	
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	10.00	19.23%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	5.00	9.62%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	17.00	32.69%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	20.00	38.46%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	22.00	32.00	93.33%	82.50%	68.75%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	37.00	52.00	82.76%	69.00%	71.15%

**Explanation of C1 Slippage**

CNMI Part C service providers actively engages families in gathering information through multiple sources of information to determine the overall rating of each outcome. The Part C program used multiple sources of information to assess each child's performance for each outcome to include but not limited to the parent interviews, observations, evaluation reports, and Hawaii Early Learning Profile.

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Of the 52 infants and toddlers that exited this reporting period, 10 or 19.2% in progress category “b” showed that they had improved in their functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to function comparable to same age peers in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their need. Five or 9.6% were in progress category “c” that showed that they had improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. The remaining infants and toddlers (37) reached or maintained functioning compared to their same aged peers. There were no infants or toddlers that did not improve functioning.

CNMI did not meet the target for Outcome C1 with a slippage of 24.58% with a performance of 68.75% for FFY 2015. Further data analysis on the length of service, age at entry, and disability criteria data to determine possible reasons for the slippage. Of children in progress categories b, 3 out of the 10 or 30% of infants and toddlers had received less than 1 year of early intervention services and 6 out the 10 or 60% of the children had less than 2 years of early intervention services. There was one (1) child out the 10 in the b progress category that had up to 3 years of early intervention services.

Further analysis on the age at entry for children in progress category “b” showed that 6 out of the 10 or 60% of the toddlers were between 12 to 24 months of age when they first entered and received early intervention services. Two (2) out of the 10 or 20% were between the ages of 25 to 36 months when they first received early intervention services.

Seven (7) of the 10 or 70% of the children in progress category “b” were eligible as established condition and 3 or 30% were eligible as developmental delay.

Stakeholders focused on the children in Category “b” because these are the children who improved functioning but not sufficient to their same age peers. Based on stakeholder input, the reason for the slippage may be attributed to the short time children had in accessing and receiving early intervention services. In addition, stakeholders discussed the low “n” size of children that participated in the ECO measurements. For FFY 2014, there were only 29 infants and toddlers that exited the program compared to the 52 infants and toddlers that exited in FFY 2015. Caution should be taken in interpreting the reasons for the slippage based due to the low “n” size used in computing the slippages for this reporting period.

Was sampling used? No

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In accordance to 618 Exiting Data, 63 infants and toddlers exited Part C Program for FFY 2015-2016. Of the 63 infants and toddlers that exited, 52 of the 63 or 82.54% of children received Early Childhood Outcome Measurements.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 4: Family Involvement**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2006	Target ≥			91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
		Data			94.00%	94.00%	77.00%	100%	92.00%	94.00%	96.00%	96.30%	97.89%
B	2006	Target ≥			91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
		Data			93.00%	91.00%	80.00%	96.00%	93.00%	93.00%	96.00%	96.30%	97.89%
C	2006	Target ≥			90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%
		Data			94.00%	94.00%	77.00%	96.00%	94.00%	91.00%	95.50%	93.52%	94.74%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	94.10%
Target B ≥	93.00%	93.00%	94.00%	94.00%
Target C ≥	92.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.10%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	124.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	109.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	113.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	110.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	113.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	110.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	113.00

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	97.89%	93.00%	96.46%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	97.89%	93.00%	97.35%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	94.74%	92.00%	97.35%

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

As per OSEP's instructions, the CNMI Part C Family Survey used for 2008 - 2009 is not attached because the same survey was used and provided in the

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

FFY 2006 APR. The family survey instruments were distributed to all families who received services during this reporting year, including families who may have exited prior to the December 1 child count. The surveys were disseminated in 3 “respondent groups:”

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

Families were asked to respond to each survey statement by choosing a number from 1 through 5 that represented their level of disagreement or agreement with the statement. The “New” survey included statements related to the knowledge and skills of families entering the program. The “Ongoing” survey items included statements that reflected the expectations of receiving continued services, including 6-month and annual IFSP reviews. The “Exiting” survey included specific statements related to transition.

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

- Know their rights;
- Effectively communicate their need; and
- Help their children to develop and learn

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

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

Of the 124 surveys that were distributed to families on Saipan, Tinian, and Rota, 113 were returned. A return rate of 91.13%.  
52 "New" surveys  
34 "Ongoing" surveys  
38 "Exiting" surveys

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0.83%	0.85%	0.87%	0.89%	0.91%	0.91%	0.91%	0.92%	0.92%
Data		0.85%	1.00%	0.77%	0.31%	0.77%	1.20%	0.27%	1.02%	1.77%	0.75%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0.93%	0.93%	0.94%	0.95%

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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	6	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	null	1,072

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
6	1,072	0.75%	0.93%	0.56%

**Explanation of Slippage**

For FFY 2015, CNMI did not meet the target for this indicator. For this reporting period, there were 6 infants identified and served under age 1. Based on OSEP’s guidance for this Indicator, CNMI must use the 2010 Census data of 1072 births in determining the percentage served. For FFY 2015 the percentage served is .56% (6/ 1072). This is a slippage from FFY 2014 performance of .75%.

As for National performance data reported as of December 1, 2015, CNMI performance is below the national performance data of 1.20%.

The stakeholders drill down the following data points: primary referral sources, the number of child find and public awareness activities and reasons for declining services to determine possible root causes for not meeting the target of .93%.

For FFY 2015, there were a total of 102 referrals for early intervention services for the calendar year. Of the 102, 57 or 56% (57/102) were found eligible for EI services, 38 or 37% (38/102) parents declined EI services, and 7 infants did not qualify for EI services.

Based on further analysis, the following are referral sources:

- 66 Hospital
- 21 parents/families

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- 3 private clinic
- 6 EI Program
- 3 Division of Youth Service (CAPTA)
- 2 Home Visiting Program
- 1 Child Care

The EI program continues to offer child find and public awareness activities in collaboration with other early childhood serving agencies. Such activities include public service announcements, outreach parent training/ forum in Rota, Baby Fair, and screening at the community health centers.

Stakeholders discussed the possible reasons for the high number of infants that decline EI services. A major reason is because families are not ready to receive EI services and feel that their child is developing fine. One of the recommendations from the ICC is to revisit SOP for those families that decline services. One strategy is to have service coordinators reconnect with families within 2 months to inquiry how the child and family are doing. This open communication will reinforce the importance of monitoring their child’s development and that when families are ready they are welcome at any time.

The Public Health Service Coordinators are charged with conducting developmental screening for children birth through age 3. Parents or health care providers that have concerns on whether the child is meeting his/ her developmental milestones are encouraged to make a referral for developmental screening with the Public Health Service Coordinators. For FFY 2015, there were 111 referrals made to Public Health for developmental screening. Of the 111 referrals, 28 infants were screened using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and are currently on the Public Health’s monitoring list or were referred to EI should their ASQ result indicate below cut-off. The remaining 83 or 75% (83/111) referrals made by health care providers could not be located.

In regards to the 75% of babies that cannot be located and were referred to Public Health for screening, the stakeholders discussed the high rate of tourist births that continue to occur in the islands. The ICC discussed the possibilities that tourist birth mothers leave the island immediately upon receiving birth records. This may be why babies that were referred cannot be located for developmental screening.

According to the Commonwealth Health Care Corporation and Vital Statistics Office, total births from January 2014 to October of 2016 yield a total of 3,141. This total averages 95 births a month with a total estimate birth of 1,142 per year.

As reported in the Saipan Tribune (November 30, 2016), in 2014, a total of 1,076 babies of foreign national parents were born on Saipan, with China consisting of 1,034 live births at 96.38 percent. Second to China was Korea, at 29 live births (2.69 percent), Philippines at six live births (0.55 percent), Japan at two live births (0.18 percent), Russia at four live births (0.37 percent), and Kazakhstan, with one live birth for 2014 (0.09 percent). Link to the article: <https://www.saipantribune.com/index.php/births-foreign-parents-raise-questions/>

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.40%	1.50%	1.70%	1.80%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data		1.58%	1.60%	1.40%	1.51%	1.39%	1.60%	1.24%	1.83%	2.33%	2.49%

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.10%	2.10%	2.20%	2.20%

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 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	53	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	null	3216

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
53	3,216	2.49%	2.10%	1.65%

**Explanation of Slippage**

For FFY 2015, CNMI did not meet the target for this indicator. For this reporting period, there were 53 infants and toddlers identified and served under age 3. Based on OSEP's guidance for this Indicator, CNMI must use the 2010 Census data of 3,216 births in determining the percentage served birth to three. For FFY 2015 the percentage served was 1.65 % (53/ 3216).

In comparison with the National performance data of children served on December 1, 2015, CNMI is below the national data of 3.00%.

CNMI reported a slippage of .84% in performance for FFY 2015 of 1.65% this indicator in comparison to FFY 2014 of performance of 2.49% for this indicator. The stakeholders reviewed and provided comments to the drilled down the following data points: primary referral sources, disability, the number of child find and public awareness activities and reasons for declining services to determine possible root causes for not meeting the target of 2.1 %.

For FFY 2015, there were a total of 102 referrals for early intervention services for the calendar year. Of the 102, 57 or 56% (57/102) were found eligible for EI services, 38 or 37% (38/102) parents declined EI services, and 7 infants did not qualify for EI services.

Based on further analysis, the following are referral sources:

- 66 Hospital

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

- 21 parents/families
- 3 private clinic
- 6 EI Program
- 3 Division of Youth Service (CAPTA)
- 2 Home Visiting Program
- 1 Child Care

Further data analysis was conducted to determine the disability category by age group:

- Birth to One: 6 were Established Condition
- 1 to 2 years: 7 Developmental Delay and 9 Established Condition
- 2 to 3 years: 14 Developmental Delay and 15 Established Condition

Of the 53 reported for this indicator, 57% (30/53) were eligible as established condition and 43% (23/53) were developmental delay. The ICC discussed the need to continue to provide training for primary referral sources specifically for early childhood programs and to promote the importance of developmental screening.

The EI program continues to offer child find and public awareness activities in collaboration with other early childhood serving agencies. Such activities include public service announcements, outreach parent training/ forum in Rota, Baby Fair, and screening at the community health centers.

Stakeholders discussed the possible reasons for the high number of infants that decline EI services. A major reason is because families are not ready to receive EI services and feel that their child is developing fine. One of the recommendations from the ICC is to revisit SOP for those families that decline services. One strategy is to have service coordinators reconnect with families within 2 months to inquiry how the child and family are doing. This open communication will reinforce the importance of monitoring their child's development and that when families are ready they are welcome at any time.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

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

**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		98.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
52	52	100%	100%	100%
<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>				0

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

The reporting period is from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

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

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

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

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of 7/31/2017" Page 19 of 35

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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 2014**

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

**OSEP Response****Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

**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		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
40	40	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0
--	---

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

The reporting period is from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

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

In the CNMI, children **potentially eligible for Part B** services are defined as those children who, based on current evaluation, assessment and IFSP information, continue to demonstrate a 25% delay in one or more areas of development or have an established condition that has a high probability of resulting in a disability that aligns with the Part B eligibility definitions or categories and because of that condition or disability, the child may need special education and related services. The determination of whether the child is potentially eligible for Part B is made by that toddler's IFSP team. Part B eligibility is determined by the Part B providers. Individual "referral notice" is sent to the Special Education Program which triggers the Part B child find process. Upon parental consent to release information, pertinent information such as evaluation reports, current IFSPs, Outcome Measurement information, and other information is sent to the Special Education Program team to prepare for the transition conference. Upon approval of the parent, a Transition Conference is scheduled and meeting invitations are sent to receiving special education teams and the preschool providers. The CNMI does not have an "opt out" policy for parents to opt out of the referral. Service Coordinators are required to submit all documentation related to the transition

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response 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 2014**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

**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		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

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

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
40	40	100%	100%	100%

<p><b>Number of parents who opted out</b> This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</p>	0
---	---

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

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

The data reporting period is from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

The reporting period is from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

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

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

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response 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 2014

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

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

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

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

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

### 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		100%	93.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

### FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
40	40	100%	100%	100%

<b>Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference</b> <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	0
<b>Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances</b> <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0

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

- State monitoring
- State database

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

The reporting period is from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

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

In the CNMI, children **potentially eligible for Part B** services are defined as those children who, based on current evaluation, assessment and IFSP information, continue to demonstrate a 25% delay in one or more areas of development or have an established condition that has a high probability of resulting in a disability that aligns with the Part B eligibility definitions or categories and because of that condition or disability, the child may need special

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response 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 2014**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data:

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

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

The CNMI reported no resolution sessions during this reporting period. The CNMI reported fewer than 10 resolution session held FY 2015. The CNMI is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which 10 or more resolutions are held.

The IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Template (template) attached to the Progress Page reports that the CNMI has adopted Part C due process hearing procedures. However, in the template attached to the Progress Page in the FFY 2014 APR, CNMI reported that it adopted Part B due process hearing procedures. The CNMI must clarify and, if necessary, resubmit information to the EMAPS system to reflect the due process hearing procedures that are in place.

CNMI Response:

The CNMI continues to use Part B due process hearing procedures. The CNMI will update, resubmit and correct information on EMAPS that reflect the use of Part B due process hearing procedures. When EMAPS re-opens on May 4, the CNMI will go in and correct the information. There is NO changes made to the data for this Indicator. The CNMI reports 0 for this reporting period.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

**FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The CNMI continues to use Part B due process hearing procedures. The CNMI will update, resubmit and correct information on EMAPS that reflect the use of Part B due process hearing procedures. When EMAPS re-opens on May 4, the CNMI will go in and correct the information. There is NO changes made to the data for this Indicator. The CNMI reports 0 for this reporting period.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

none

**OSEP Response**

The CNMI reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2015. The CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 10: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

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

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

**FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2015	2016	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 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

**FFY 2015 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 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

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

As stated in OSEP's response, The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2015. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**OSEP Response**

The CNMI reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2015. The CNMI is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

--

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: 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
Target		52.00%	55.00%
Data	45.00%	69.60%	58.30%

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

**FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	58.00%	63.00%	66.00%

Key:

**Description of Measure**

Based on a comprehensive data and infrastructure analysis, the CNMI Part C State Identified Measurable Target is to improve self-help skills of infants and toddlers who exit the early intervention program in area of dressing, feeding, and toileting skills.

Please refer to the attached document, pages 1-2 for the Description of Measure.

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

**Overview**

**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 Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, 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., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, 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.

**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 EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. 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 other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new 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.

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Please refer to the attached document , pages 12-29 for the Infrastructure Analysis Component of the CNMI Part C SSIP.

### State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

**.By June 2019, at least 66% of infants and toddlers who exit the early intervention program will have appropriate behaviors in toileting, dressing, and feeding skills that are closer to their same age peers, as measured by the Child Self-Help Checklist.**

Description

Please refer to the attached document, pages 30-32 for the SIMR Component of the CNMI Part C 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 Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. 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 EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Please refer to the attached document, pages 33-38 for the Coherent Improvement Strategies Component of the CNMI Part C 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 EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

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

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

The Theory of Action Graphic has been inserted.

Please refer to the attached document, pages 39-40 for the Theory of Action Component of the CNMI Part C SSIP.

### Infrastructure Development

- 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.
- 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.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- 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.

Please see attached SSIP Phase II document.

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

- 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

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Please see attached SSIP Phase II document.

### 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.

Please see attached SSIP Phase II document.

### 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.

Please see attached SSIP Phase II document.

### 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 SSIP Phase III document.

### 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.

### 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

### 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

### 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

**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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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

**Selected:** Lead Agency Director

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

Name: Cynthia I. Deleon Guerrero, M Ed

Title: Commissioner of Education

Email: coe.cdlg@cnmipss.org

Phone: 670-237-3061