

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Section A: Data Analysis

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

By June 30, 2019, at least 55% of 3rd grade students with IEPs in three target schools will perform at or above reading proficiency against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards as measured by the state assessment.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? No

If “Yes”, provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Baseline Data: 2013-14: 14%

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission? No

FFY 2018 Target: 46%

FFY 2019 Target: 55%

FFY 2018 Date: 7.69%

FFY 2019 Data: No data available

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? NA*

Did slippage¹ occur? NA

If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

*For FFY2019, no data is available due to COVID-19 pandemic which resulted in district wide school closures. No statewide assessment was administered.

¹ The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
 - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
 - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
 - a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
 - b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? Yes

If “Yes”, describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The secondary data collected by the CNMI PSS data from the Renaissance STAR Early Literacy/Reading universal screening data for grades K – 3rd. The first and second screenings were conducted in October 2020 and January 2021 respectively. The results are given below:

Participation

	# of ALL Students/Students with IEPs	# of ALL Students Screened/Students with IEPs*	Participation Rate (ALL)/Students w/IEPs*
Screening 1:	1089/94	1059/90	97%/96%
Screening 2:	1087/148	1064/148	98%/100%

Performance

<u>Performance Level</u>	<u>Screening #1</u>	<u>Screening #2</u>	<u>Screening #1</u>	<u>Screening #2</u>
	# of Students/Students w/IEPs	# of Students/Students w/IEPs	% of Students/Students w/IEPs	% of Students/Students w/IEPs
At or above Benchmark	259/1	343/3	24%/1%	33%/3%
On-Watch	163/4	156/7	15%/4%	15%/5%
Intervention	203/12	204/21	19%/13%	19%/14%
Urgent Intervention	429/69	352/110	41%/77%	33%/74%
	1054/86	1055/141		

***Note:** Participation rates include students who were screened using an “alternate screening tool.”

The results of Screening #2 indicate that 8% and 3% of ALL students and students with IEPs respectively were not in need of “urgent intervention” as compared to Screening #1 while there was an increase of 9% and 2% of ALL students and students with IEPs respectively that performed at or above benchmark. The percentage of students that performed at the “Urgent Intervention” level decreased for both ALL students and students with an IEP by 8% and 3% respectively.

In comparison with the data from SY19-20 for the same screening periods, there was a decrease of 9% and 8% respectively for Screening #1 and #2 for all students and 6% and 5% decrease for students with IEPs. The COVID-19 pandemic and the decrease in instructional time may account for the decrease.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? No

If “Yes”, describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? Yes

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

- (1) The impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator:** The schools deviated from the universal screening Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). This deviation was made to the screening periods. The screening periods were actually extended outside of the 10-day as stated in the SOP. Due to COVID-19, the flexibility to screen only one content per day as per the SOP was not possible. Students were administered all the subtests in one day which may have impacted the results. Due to limited access to the classrooms and the public health social distancing requirements, it was not possible to collect fidelity data on the implementation of the universal screening tool. The lack of fidelity data may result in lack of reliable and valid outcome data. In addition, the statewide summative assessment was not conducted in the Spring of 2020. All schools were closed and instruction was limited.
- (2) An explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator:**
- a) Due to COVID-19, some students with disabilities did not want to come to school for health issues as the screenings were conducted face-to-face.
 - b) In October 2020, all instruction was conducted virtually and blended instruction was implemented in January 2021 (2nd semester). For the 2nd semester, each classroom was separated into two cohorts. Each cohort received two days of face to face and one day of virtual instruction. The schedule was as follows: All students received their one day of virtual instruction on Mondays. Tuesdays and Thursdays were face to face instruction for Cohort 1 and Wednesdays and Fridays for Cohort 2. The mandated provision of face to face instruction for all students for at least two days increased the collection of data for students that did not participate in the first screening at a time in which all instruction was conducted virtually and students had to make arrangements to come in for the screening. The implementation of two cohort groups did not allow for five days of instruction and the need for additional personnel on campus. The need to adhere to the social distancing requirements did not allow for the time needed for students to fully benefit from the instruction. The literacy coaches were assigned to the classroom on as needed basis and therefore it was not possible to collect data on implementation and effectiveness of the coaching program.
- (3) Any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.** The PSS extended the period for conducting the universal screenings. Teachers were allowed to conduct virtual instruction at the school campus which made it possible to conduct observations on the implementation of the reading curriculum.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? No

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? No

If “Yes”, describe each new (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State continued to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

I. Strand: Governance/Leadership:

- A. **Universal Screening:** The PSS continues to implement the universal screening and the use of the results as secondary data for student outcomes. Outcomes achieved are provided in Page 3.
- B. **Implementation of Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum:** Performance Indicator 7: Percent of teachers implementing at least 75% of the Journeys Checklist components. Forty-four percent (44%) K-3 teachers were observed from the three target schools. Of the 24 teachers, 17% were observed meeting the indicator. However, the observer noted that the observations were limited to 30 to 60 minutes and not the full 120 minutes of the English Language Arts (ELA) period.

II. Strand: Professional Development:

- A. **Early Warning System for K-3:** This was a collaborative effort with the Pacific Regional Educational Laboratory. There were five schools that participated in this initiative. The PD included reviewing patterns of students, review of best practices, and evidence-based practices in reading. Outcome was the alignment of all statewide initiatives to ensure the identification of students in need of supplemental intervention.
- B. **School-based training in the Foundations of Reading.** Refer to results of Screening 1 & 2 on page 3.
- C. **IEP Training for all PSS special education teachers on present levels of performance, annual goals, and specially-designed instruction (SDI):** To measure impact of training, fifteen (15) IEPs, from three SSIP schools, were reviewed by three individuals to determine if the IEP met the criteria for the present levels, annual goals, and SDI. Of the 15 IEPs, 27% (4/15) met the criteria for present levels, 45% (7/15) met the criteria for annual goals, and 7% (1/7) met the criteria for the SDI statements.
- D. **Coaching:** For SY20-21, literacy coaches are under the jurisdiction of the principals. Due to COVID-19, no data was collected on impact of the coaching. Coaches were assigned to the classrooms as needed. The PSS partnered with McREL to provide coaching to the coaches on remote learning strategies and use of technology for teaching foundational skills. Training for the coaches was limited and no data was collected on impact.

III. Strand: Collaborative Efforts

The PSS continued with the use of the *Professional Learning Communities* (PLC) collaborative model between general and special education teachers; however, due to COVID-19, PLCs were scheduled on austerity days to address the following: learning loss, review of data (1xmonth), and blended learning. Upon availability of data, data discussion occurred with the PLCs. Grade levels met, but did not always include SPED teachers due to conflicting schedules.

IV. Strand: Accountability System: School wide Plans have all been submitted and progress updates submitted in January.

V. Strand: Monitoring System: Classroom observations continued to be collected during this reporting period.

For this reporting period, the overall score for the ELEOT tool was obtained for each target school and the average of the three schools was computed. The outcome is that the schools will obtain an overall ELEOT score of 3.5 or higher. Average of the three target schools was 3.70.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy.

Improvement Strategies

I. Strand: Governance/Leadership:

Strategy: Implementation of universal screening and implementation of an evidence-based reading curriculum. The outcomes were evaluated through universal screening data and classroom observations. Outcome data is provided in Page 3. The data from the universal screening provides information on professional development needs of the teachers as well as identification of students in need of targeted and/or intensive interventions.

II. Strand: Professional Development: The outcomes were evaluated through the following: (a) Classroom observations in the implementation of evidence-based reading curriculum (i.e. Journeys); (b) Review of IEPs for the three components in which training was provided: Present level of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP), annual goals, and specially-designed instruction (SDI); (c) For SY2019-20, professional development activities was provided to coaches as stated in the previous section. However, no data was available on impact of the provision of coaching due to the change in mode of instruction (i.e. online vs. face to face). Coaches were assigned to the classroom on as needed basis. The evaluation data from the professional development activities provide information on professional development needs of the teachers' changes in classroom teaching practices and behaviors.

III. Strand: Collaborative Efforts: In previous reporting periods, the evaluation for the outcomes of collaborative efforts between general education and special education teachers were conducted by observations. However, for SY2019-20, collaboration efforts were limited and were held on an informal basis online which made it a challenge for observations. The data from the collaborative efforts determines future activities for professional development for the general and special education teachers and data dialogue.

IV. Strand: Accountability: This strategy was evaluated through a review of the School Wide Plans (SWPs). The reviews were conducted by the Accountability, Research, and Evaluation (ARE) office. Schools are required to report on a quarterly basis on achievements. Data collected quarterly monitors expenditures and achievement of intended outputs.

V. Strand: Monitoring: This strategy was evaluated through the use of the Effective Learning Environment Observation Tool (ELEOT) with focus on two indicators: Equitable Learning Environment (A2) and Supportive Learning Environment (C3). Results of the observations are provided in Page 8. The evaluation data monitors fidelity of the implementation of the evidence-based reading curriculum and provides information for professional development.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

Next Steps for each infrastructure improvement strategies:

I. Strand: Governance/Leadership:

- A. **Strategy: Universal Screening:** The next step will be to include the scale-up schools in the collection and analysis of the universal screening data in order to identify students in need of intervention and professional development needs.
- B. **Strategy: Implementation of evidence-based reading curriculum.** The next step is to collect fidelity data on the scale-up schools on the implementation of the reading curriculum and impact on the reading proficiency of students.

II. Strand: Professional Development (PD):

- A. **Strategy: Implementation of PD and Technical Assistance Structure:** Continue with providing professional development in the implementation of the evidence-based reading curriculum (Journeys) and the collection and analysis of the universal screening data in all elementary schools (target and scale-up schools). Outcomes attained will be increased fidelity in the implementation of the reading curriculum and increased identification of students in need of intervention.
- B. **Strategy: Implementation of Coaching:** The next step is to modify the role of the coaches with the expanded role of coaching with a focus on meeting the needs of English Language Learners (ELL).

III. Strand: Collaborative Efforts:

Strategy: Implementation of a Collaborative Structure/Model: The next step is to resume face to face, formalized professional learning communities (PLCs) and collect observation data on effectiveness of collaborative efforts to impact achievement of students with IEPs and the use of data dialogues.

IV. Strand: Accountability Systems: Strategy - Improved School Wide Plans (SWP) Process

The next step is to continue systematic implementation of School Wide Plans (SWPs) in all schools (target and scale-up schools) and evaluate SWPs by measuring outcomes on student achievement and disaggregating data by subgroups.

- V. **Strand: Monitoring System: Strategy- Improved Monitoring Process.** The next is to expand the classroom observations to scale-up schools and determine impact of implementation of reading curriculum on student outcomes specifically related to reading proficiency.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Did the State implement any new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices? No

If “Yes”, describe the selection process for the new (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Provide a summary of the continued evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR.

The PSS continues to implement the following evidence-based practices:

- I. **Universal Screening:** In alignment with the current evidence-based practice of universal screening, the PSS has also implemented an “Early Warning System” initiative that infuses the data from the universal screening. These practices are intended to identify the students who are at risk or may be at risk for failure. The alignment of these two practices will support the identification and provision of evidence-based interventions to impact the SiMR.
- II. **Literacy Coaching:** The provision of literacy coaches continues to be implemented at all targeted and scale-up schools on a limited-basis with the goal of supporting professional learning. For SY2019-20, the coaches were assigned to the classroom on as needed basis. The provision of continued and on-site professional learning will increase and maintain the knowledge and skills of teachers in the area of reading in order to increase the long-term outcome of increasing students’ proficiency in reading which is the focus of the SiMR.
- III. **Fidelity of Implementation of Reading Curriculum:** Classroom fidelity observations of reading curriculum continue to be collected from all elementary schools. The information is used to determine areas for improvement and to provide data-based and school-based professional learning activities. The increase of teachers’ proficiency in the delivery of an evidence-based reading curriculum is intended to impact the SiMR.

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

- I. **Universal Screening:** Students are screened three times a year: Sept/Oct, Dec., and April/May. Each level (classroom, grade, school, and district) analyzes the data to determine the students achieving progress or lack of progress. The type of intervention is then determined based on an in-depth analysis of individual and/or class level data. In previous reporting periods, fidelity data on the implementation of the screening was conducted. However, for this reporting period, it has been difficult to collect fidelity data on the implementation of the screening due to COVID-19 and social distancing requirements.
- II. **Literacy Coaching:** For SY2019-20, no data was collected as the provision of coaching was limited. Coaches were assigned to the classroom on as needed basis.
- III. **Core Reading Curriculum:** The Office of Curriculum and Instruction (OCI) has been conducting observations of the implementation of Journeys, the evidence-based reading curriculum (i.e. fidelity data). The data is then analyzed to determine professional learning needs at the school and classroom level on the implementation of the curriculum.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices.

I. Professional Development:

During this reporting period, the professional learning activities included the following:

- Training was provided on the administration of the universal screening tool to returning and new teachers.
- With the use of the online Renaissance University, new teachers were provided training on the STAR Customized assessment (CBM component). In addition to customized training, trainings were conducted quarterly for all teachers through Renaissance University (online platform).
- Literacy coaches worked with grade levels that have new teachers on a limited basis. Grade level representatives offer coaching throughout the year.

II. Policies/procedures

- There was at least one policy change regarding the instructional schedule. The instructional requirement went from instructional days to instructional minutes with an adjustment to the school calendar during this pandemic period.
- For the first semester which started in October 2020, all instruction was provided through remote learning with limited face-to-face instruction provided for students requiring urgent intervention. This involved students with or without a disability as a result of COVID-19. At the start of 2nd semester, there was a shift from remote learning to blended learning. Students were divided into two cohorts and there were two days of face to face and one day of distance learning. Remote learning is conducted on Mondays for all students while Cohort 1 received face-to-face instruction on Tuesdays and Thursdays and Cohort 2 on Wednesdays and Fridays.

**Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

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

The PSS utilized the specific strategies to engage stakeholders:

1. School-level meetings: Schools conducted virtual meetings with parents.
2. The PSS held meetings that included members of the Parent Advisory Council and the management team. The focus was on reopening plans and learning platforms as well as returning to traditional activities such as graduation ceremonies.
3. The PSS Special Education Program conducted meetings with the Special Education State Advisory Panel (SESAP) to gather input and feedback on the annual performance report (APR) as well as the SSIP report.
4. The Youth Advisory Panel was utilized as the venue for obtaining input from students that focused on the reopening of schools and the impact of COVID-19 and traditional activities such as graduation.
5. The PSS also conducted a social media campaign and obtained stakeholder feedback through the completion of online surveys.
6. The classroom teachers from each of the target schools were instrumental in providing the outcome data for the universal screening. Each classroom summarizes their classroom data and submits to the principals. The principals then summarize the school data. Data dialogues are conducted to review the data at the grade level.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? No

If “Yes”, describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) SSIP Phase III Year 5
FFY 2019 Indicator B-17 Annual Performance Report (APR)

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response.

Not applicable.