STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY 2021

Northern Mariana Islands

PART B DUE February 1, 2023

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

By June 30, 2026, at least 39% of 3rd grade students with an IEP in the elementary schools will perform at or above reading proficiency against grade level and alternate academic achievement.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The CNMI is using 3rd graders for the SiMR based on risk factors associated if a student is not reading by 3rd grade.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://www.cnmipss.org/sites/default/files/cnmi_b_toa_2022_508_compliant_0.pdf

Progress toward the SiMR

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

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	26.92%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	27.00%	30.00%	33.00%	36.00%	39.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

# of 3rd Graders with an IEP in the Three Target Schools who scored At or Above Proficient in Reading	# of 3rd Graders with an IEP in the Three Target Schools with Valid Scores in Reading	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4	31	26.92%	27.00%	12.90%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

CNMI did not meet its Indicator 17 target and reported slippage by 14.02% from 26.92% (7/26) in FFY 2020 to 12.90% (4/31) in FFY 2021. By numbers, the percentages represented seven 3rd graders with an IEP in FFY 2020 and four 3rd graders with an IEP in FFY 2021 who scored at the proficient level in the three target schools, with an increase in the overall 3rd graders with an IEP in the target schools from 26 in FFY 2020 to 31 in FFY 2021.

As noted in Indicators 3B and 3C, a consideration for the slippage is the impact of COVID-19 on instruction. The beginning of school year 2021-2022 continued the PSS blended learning approach of online and face-to-face instruction. Due to the rise in COVID-19 cases, PSS then shifted to remote learning in November 2021 until January 2022 when schools and services were back to face-to-face. This disruption in the mode of learning could have impacted the instruction of students. In an effort to improve instruction for

our students with IEPs, this 2022-2023 school year, the CNMI Special Education Program assigned an itinerant special education teacher to address any technical assistance needs in the schools related to the identification and service provisions of the IEP. Additionally, the program partnered with an OSEP-funded TA center, the PROGRESS Center, to provide training and technical support on the development and implementation of IEPs, with emphasis on specially designed instruction (SDI).

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

For SY21-22, the CNMI Public School System (PSS) Renaissance STAR Reading (k-3) assessment proficiency data from the end of the year outcomes and the multi-state alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The data is collected by school and disaggregated by subgroups and then summarized for the three target schools. The data for the SIMR are analyzed for the proficiency rate by identifying the percentage of 3rd grade students with an IEP performing at or above the benchmark standard score for the 3rd grade as measured by the Renaissance STAR Reading and determined proficient as measured by the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS).
The data collected included the 3rd grade IEP students with valid scores in the three SSIP target schools. The numerator of "4" represented those 3rd grade IEP students with a valid score in the three SSIP target schools who scored at the proficient level in reading as measured by the Renaissance STAR Reading and AA-AAS. The denominator of "31" represented the total number of 3rd grade IEP students with a valid score in the three target schools.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* **that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The PSS conducts three benchmark screenings annually. For this reporting period, the Fall screening was conducted from September 19 - October 07, 2022. The Spring screening was scheduled for January 23 - February 03, 2023. Outcome data from SY 2021-2022, conducted April 24 - May 06, 2022 was used to show proficiency trends compared to this school year's data. The benchmark screening data are used to determine the type and intensity of intervention to be provided.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://www.cnmipss.org/sites/default/files/cnmissipevaluationplanworksheet_508_compliant_0.pdf

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

STRAND: Governance and Leadership
A. Strategy: Universal Screening
The PSS continues to implement the universal screening and the use of the results as secondary data. The outcomes for this strategy were measured by conducting four screenings and a fidelity checklist. For SY21-22, the PSS adopted the Renaissance STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading as the source for the outcome data at the end of the school year by using Screening #4 data. The implementation of the universal screening has scaled-up to the remaining elementary schools. However, due to COVID-19, Screening #2 for SY21-22 was canceled as students were placed in remote learning. For this reporting period, the fidelity checklists were collected from randomly selected teachers from the scale-up schools.

B. Strategy: Implementation of the Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum
For this reporting period, the PSS continued to implement Journeys as its Early Literacy and Reading curriculum with the core instruction focusing on the foundations of reading. However, during this reporting period, the PSS explored the possibility of selecting another evidence-based core curriculum to address the issue of blended learning (i.e., face to face and virtual instruction).

C. Strategy: Early Warning Systems (EWS) for Grades Kinder through 3rd
This strategy addresses the identification of students exhibiting academic and behavior-at-risk performance who are in need of supplemental interventions to improve academic performance.

D. Strategy: High Dosage Tutoring
High Dosage Tutoring (HDT) addresses the academic needs of students requiring Tier 2 and 3 academic intervention(s).

E. Strategy: Establishment of a Family Engagement and Community Involvement Program
The goal of this strategy is to increase the performance of students in the PSS through better engagement of families and the community in the education of students in the CNMI Public school through the provision of professional learning opportunities.

Strand: Professional Development
A. Strategy: Early Warning Systems (EWS) for Grades K-3
Two Data Team Meetings were conducted by two of the early adopters schools. Participants included their K-3 school teams and the district EWS Team

B. Strategy: Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)
In August 2022, the district provided a Training of Trainers workshop for all Elementary school teams on the SEL Program: Positive Action. Positive Action School level professional development was conducted for all K-5th grade teachers with a 100% participation rate.

C. Strategy: ELL Program/ELL Teachers
In August 2022, ELL Teachers were provided with ELL and SIOP Training facilitated by Pearson. WIDA assessment training was conducted October through December 2022 for ELL teachers and school level teachers. ELL teachers hold monthly meetings to address any ELL topics, programs, documents, data and other miscellaneous items.

D. Strategy: High Dosage Tutoring
Two training sessions were held in August and October for all high dosage tutors and peer tutors.

E. Strategy: Development, Review, and Implementation of the IEP.
Four professional development sessions were conducted during this reporting period.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.
STRAND: Governance and Leadership
1a. Strategy: Universal Screening
The intermediate outcome includes the participation and proficiency data for all students and disaggregated for students with an IEP in grades K-3rd grade. For this reporting period, screening #3 and #4 for the SY21-22. Screening #4 was used as the outcome data for SY21-22. Benchmark data for SY22-23 is limited to the Fall'22 screening as the Winter screening will not be available until after the submission of this report.

Participation (K-3rd)
                       # Of ALL Students/Students with IEP   # of ALL Students Screened/Students with IEP * Participation Rate (ALL)/Students w/IEP*
Screening #3 (Winter'22)   1058/95   997*/76* 94%/80%
Screening #4 (Outcome - SPR'22) 1039/104   1007*/89*   97%/86%
Screening #1 (Fall'22)   980/98   944*/84*   96%/86%
*The # of students screened includes K-3rd grade students that were screened with STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, or alternate screening assessment.

Proficiency Rate
Performance Level   # of All Students/Students w/IEP   % of All Students/Students with an IEP
 Screening #3 (Winter'22)
At or above Benchmark   **404/**5 41%/7%

Screening #4 (Outcome-SPR'22)
At or above Benchmark   **496/**9   49%/10%

Screening #1 (Fall'22)
At or above Benchmark   **329/**7   35%/8%

1b. STAR Early Literacy/Reading Fidelity Data
The collection of fidelity data for the implementation of the STAR universal screening was conducted in 8 of the 9 elementary schools by either the principal or assistant principal. The checklist addressed the tasks "Before Testing", 'During Testing", and "After Testing." Each observer was asked to rate the tasks under each task as "clearly evident", "somewhat evident", or "not observed. "Before Testing" included 7 items and a rating of "Clearly Evident" ranged from 78.3% to 97.8% with the highest percentage related to the task of scheduling the testing and the lowest involving printing the student log in materials, reviewing and pretest instructions. The "During Testing" consisted of 6 items and a rating of "Clearly evident" ranged from 51.2% to 97.8%. The task achieving the highest was one in which the teacher walked around the room to monitor the students during administration while the task with the lowest was one in which teachers were observed administering the math prior to the reading subtest. The "After Testing" tasks

consisted of 3 items. The range of ratings as "Clearly Evident" was from 45.7% to 54.3%. The task with the highest rating of "clearly evident" involved the printing and/or review of the student reports on the STAR dashboard. Please note that a task may not have obtained a rating of "clearly evident" if the task was not required at the time of the observation.

*The # of students screened includes K-3rd grade students that were screened with STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, or alternate screening assessment.
Strategy: Implementation of the Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum
For this reporting period, the PSS continued to implement Journeys as its Early Literacy and Reading curriculum with the core instruction focusing on the foundations of reading. However, during this reporting period, the PSS explored the possibility of selecting another evidence-based core curriculum to address the issue of blended learning (i.e., face to face and virtual instruction).

Strategy: Early Warning Systems (EWS) for Grades Kinder through 3rd
The EWS identified 65.7% 6 of K-3 students that are at Urgent Intervention in Star Reading and Early Literacy at the EWS schools. At this time, the data is limited to the number of students who are "flagged" and not the number of students receiving an intervention. As of this reporting period, 5/9 or 56% of elementary schools are actively utilizing the EWS processes and tools. The remaining schools are still adapting the tools and processes for their school but are not fully implementing them at this time.

In a survey from 9 school teams implementing the EWS, 62.5 % (5 out of 8)reported that they are importing correct and complete student data into the EWS data collection tool while 55.6% (5/9) are using the EWS tool to assign students to interventions in a systematic manner (tracking of interventions).

Strategy: High Dosage Tutoring
The enrollment for the nine elementary schools is 2222 of which 237 or 10.7% are receiving high dosage tutoring services.

Strategy: Family Engagement & Community Involvement
The following activities were implemented as strategies for improving the achievement of all students.
The PTSA had proposed that $5000 be allocated to each school each year to conduct parent trainings as well as to increase parent engagement and involvement in each of the schools that will result in increased academic performances. During this reporting period, a total of 19 schools had submitted proposals that were approved and plans completed by the end of August 2022.

The PSS conducted its annual Parent Summit in November 2022 with 155 participants with a response rate of 57%. The evaluations indicated that a majority of the participants indicated the content, the ideas, and the impact were very appropriate and useful. In addition, the majority also indicated the workshop met their expectations and that it was well structured.

***Please refer to Question "Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice." for additional outcomes data.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)
NO
Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.
Governance and Leadership:
Early Warning System (EWS): Develop district wide procedures for systematic implementation of the EWS. Provide initial and follow-up training for all participants and monitor implementation.

High-Dosage Tutoring: Train school personnel in tracking progress of students receiving high-dosage tutoring and its impact on reading.

Family Engagement & Community Involvement:
Provide training and coaching to SSIP target schools (small scale) on Institute of Education Sciences (IES) REL Southeast Teacher's Guide in Supporting Families in Foundational Reading Skills.

Professional Development:
Collect data on implementation of changes in school personnel behaviors as a result of professional development that is beyond the initial reactions(after event evaluation) to the training.

Accountability/Monitoring System
Monitor the implementation of the activities identified in each of the school's School Wide Plans (SWPs) related to the provision of resources for subgroups.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

1. Universal Screening: Renaissance STAR Reading
2. Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum - Journeys
3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3
4. High-dosage Tutoring
5. School-based training in the Foundations of Reading

6. English Language Learners (ELL) Coaching
7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
8. Data-based decision making
9. Classroom observations -monitoring the fidelity in implementation of evidence-based instructional programs
10. Social and Emotional Learning- Positive Action

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

1. The universal screening: is conducted three times during the school year. The Fall and Spring are considered benchmark data with the final (3rd
   screening) considered as outcome or end of year summative data.

2. Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum – Journeys: Implemented in all elementary schools – reading instruction provided for 90 minutes.

3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3: The attendance and performance of all K-3 students are monitored on an on-going basis.

4. High Dosage Tutoring: High-Dosage Tutoring was initiated in the Summer of '20 to address the learning loss of students. Tutoring is provided during
   the school day and as part of the after school programs for 40-60 minutes in groups of a maximum of three students.

5. Professional development activities related to the Foundations of Reading

6. English Language Learners (ELL) Coaching: is to provide educational programs that allow each student the opportunity to maximize their potential
   and become proficient in English across all content areas and in diverse social environments. Each elementary school is provided with at least one
   ELL Teacher.

7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC) – Each grade level meets as a PLC team to address data and needs of every student to include needs of
   subgroups such as students with an IEP and ELLs.

8. School Wide Plans (SWPs) Data-based decision making: Each school is required to submit a School Wide Plan (SWP) each year that addresses the
   needs of the students in the school. The SWP must include activities and outcomes for subgroups such as students with an IEP and ELLs.

9. Monitoring the fidelity of reading curriculum and delivery of evidence-based instruction: Classroom observations with a duration of at least 30
   minutes are conducted at least annually.

10. Social and Emotional Learning- Positive Action: Implemented in all elementary schools to address and promote healthy and positive mental health
   for students to learn.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

1. Universal Screening: The Fall and Spring screening benchmarks identifies students at risk for not meeting end of year outcomes and provides data
   that assist school personnel in providing supplemental interventions to meet the students' needs. This practice is implemented in all elementary
   schools.

2. Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum: The implementation of an evidence-based early literacy and reading curriculum increases the probability of
   achieving the SIMR.

3. Early Warning System (EWS): The implementation of the EWS for grades K-3 is the overarching strategy that ensures that the needs of students are
   identified early enough to provide interventions and support. This is in line with implementing universal screening.

4.High Dosage Tutoring: The supplemental instruction provided by the provision of High Dosage Tutoring closes the gap between where the students
   are performing and where they should be.

5.Professional Development that is ongoing and job-embedded in the areas related to literacy and the use of data will improve delivery of literacy

instruction and improve student outcomes.

6. English Language Learners (ELL) Coaching will improve the delivery of literacy instruction that will improve student learning.

7. Professional Learning Communities allows horizontal alignment of instruction and opportunity for modeling effective practices that will increase
   student outcomes.

8. School Wide Plans (SWPs) that include outcomes for disaggregated groups will ensure that schools are held accountable for all students and
   promote data-based decision making.

9. Monitoring the implementation of the reading curriculum with a focus on the foundations of reading through fidelity checks will provide data that
   will be used to support the need for additional support and training.

10. Social and Emotional Learning- Positive Action: Implemented in all elementary schools to address and promote healthy and positive mental health
   for students to learn.

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

1. Governance/Leadership
a. Universal Screening
 -Screenings are conducted three times a year. Fidelity checks are conducted during each screening period.
b. Implementation of Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum
 -There are two forms of data collected by the Office of Curriculum & Instruction and school level administrators. Fidelity data is collected on the
 Journeys curriculum. In addition, data is collected on the delivery of core instruction in the foundations of reading. Data is collected at least once a
 year.
c. Early Warning System (EWS)
 -The impact of the implementation of the EWS will be measured by the number of students identified as needing supplemental support and the
 effectiveness of the interventions to improve instruction.
d. High Dosage Tutoring
 -Program evaluation surveys are conducted at the end of each year and the results are used to address areas for strength and areas for growth.
 -Surveys are collected from tutors, teachers, and students.

2. Professional Development
 -All professional development activities are initially evaluated with a "Reaction Survey" at the end of each activity and observations to collect data
 on change in practices.

3. Collaborative Efforts
 Professional Learning Community
 -Data on participation and data discussion of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are collected monthly.
 Family Supports/Family Partnerships
 -Data will be collected on participation of families in activities to improve student achievement as well as reaction surveys.
 -Collect parent demographics data of parents that attend parent summits, trainings, meetings.

4. Accountability System
 -School Wide Plans (SWPs) are reviewed annually and if approved, activities are funded for implementation. SWPs are evaluated to determine if the
 plan addresses the academic needs of subgroups such as students with an IEP. With this requirement, the schools are held accountable for all
 students.

5. Monitoring System
 -The Office of Curriculum & Instruction And school level administrators continue to monitor the fidelity of implementing the Journeys curriculum
 and the delivery of the Foundations of Reading as described in the section on Governance/Leadership.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

* Continuation of data from Section A and B

STRAND: Professional Development

A. Strategy: Development, Revision, and Implementation of the IEP
Two activities were conducted during this reporting period for this strategy: (1) Root Cause analysis (2) Progress Center Training.
1. Root Cause Analysis:
April/May 2022: The three SSIP target schools conducted a root cause analysis using the 5-Whys. It resulted in identifying a possible solution on why students with IEPs are not meeting benchmarks. The three groups identified the following possible solutions: (1) Matching the specially designed instruction with the student's needs and (2) Allocation of additional time for the teaching of basic foundational reading skills.

2. The second activity consisted of four professional development sessions from the Progress Center. Three of the four sessions were conducted virtually while the fourth session was conducted in person. The first two sessions focused on the "Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)" while the third session focused on using the PLAAFP to develop annual goals. The fourth session focused on the specially designed instruction (SDI), related services, and supplementary aids and services. The sessions were attended by general and special educators, administrators, teacher aides, and related service personnel. Prior to the virtual sessions, participants were requested to complete the related modules from the Progress Center. The feedback on the first three sessions indicated that a majority of the participants indicated that the content was either a review, a reinforcement of what they already knew, or increased their understanding of the content. Ninety percent (90%) of the participants indicated the activities were relevant and over 86% found them useful. Over 98% either agreed or strongly agreed that the sessions increased their awareness of the IEP and the resources from the Progress Center.
For the session conducted in December 2022, a retro evaluation format was utilized. Respondents were asked to rate their knowledge level before and after the training session. For each component of the training, the percent of participants that rated themselves as having a "high" knowledge of the content increased after the training. Additional feedback included the relevancy, usefulness, and satisfaction with the face-to-face session: 100% indicated the session was relevant and useful while 88% and 8.8% respectively were either very satisfied or satisfied.
Please note that participants were not limited to elementary schools.

3. October 31, 2022 - IEP Task Force Creation
The IEP task force is comprised of seven (7) special education teachers ranging from 3-25 years of teaching experience: 3 elementary school teachers, 2 middle school teachers, 2 high school teachers. The purpose of this IEP task force is to be the conduit to their school-level colleagues and the SEA to help build the confidence of our Special Education teachers in writing & implementing IEPs, and conducting IEP meetings, through partnership with our regional TA provider, Guam CEDDERS and national TA provider, The Progress Center. The Program outcomes include sustained implementation of this initiative by creating special education mentors from the task force members once the TA support has been exhausted. The task force is led by an Instructional Coach, under the supervision of the Special Education Director. The IEP task force has had eight (8) work sessions since November 2, 2022, and helped facilitate one training session for the special education teachers on December 17, 2022.

B. Training for ELL teachers
The Literacy Coaches were converted to English Language Learner (ELL) coaches/teachers. To support the ELL coaches/teachers ongoing, job-embedded training is provided through the monthly meetings. In addition, and ELL and SIOP training was held from August 8-12, 2022, WIDA assessment training held from October - December 2022, and a WIDA PD conference held in Sept.28-29, 2022.

C. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
Two training sessions were held during this reporting period: February 24, and March 7, 2022. These sessions focused on understanding and building proficiency in the use of data. The audience included all K-3 Elementary school data teams and the district EWS team.

Strand: Collaborative Efforts
SY 22-23 Elementary PLC Collaboration Observation - The purpose of the observation is to evaluate the extent collaboration occurs at the school level between general education and teachers from special programs (Special Education, Title I, EL Teacher). The results are as follows:
There were a total of 107 responses related to the PLC collaborative efforts. Of the 107 responses, 61% were obtained from principals and 39% were from assistant principals. The observations indicated that 100% of the PLCs had an agenda and the agenda/task included a discussion of at-risk students (i.e., English Language Learners (ELLs), students with an IEP, etc.).Ninety-three percent (93%) reported level 4 for level of engagement which is equivalent to most to all participating as a collaborative team member. In addition, 86% of the responders indicated that the collaborative teams discussed early literacy/reading to guide instructional planning, but 100% also reported that other sources of data were also discussed.

Strand: Accountability System
School Wide Plans (SWPs): 9 schools - 56% include resources for K-3 literacy in their SWPs.

Strand: Monitoring System
The PSS collected fidelity data on the implementation of Journeys (early literacy/reading curriculum) and the foundations of reading. Observations were conducted in grades K-3 from eight (8) of the nine (9) elementary schools. The checklist included the following: Classroom Environment: 82% had focus walls, 98% had established areas for whole groups, small groups, and centers. Only 73% of the observations indicated that student materials were utilized during instruction such as student textbooks, student handbook, etc; Opening Routines: 78% of the classroom included opening routines; 78% of the observations indicated that vocabulary was part of the instructional routine.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

1.Universal Screening:
 -Collect fidelity data from the scale-up schools with the anticipated outcome that teachers are implementing the screening tool appropriately.

2. Evidence-based Early Literacy and Reading Curriculum:
 -In SY 2023-2024, implementation of the new Reading curriculum: Into Reading. Professional development alignment planning, professional
 development for teachers will be provided and a new fidelity checklist will be implemented and used for monitoring.

3. Early Warning System (EWS) for K-3
 -Increase the number of schools participating in the EWS system with the outcome to timely identification of students and delivery of needed
 supplemental interventions.
 -Track the interventions being provided to students identified through EWS.

4. High Dosage Tutoring
 -Increase the capacity of each elementary school to provide High Dosage Tutoring to students in need of it with the outcome of improved
 achievement.
 -Collect HDT data on effectiveness of the program

5. Professional Development
 -Expand the training in the foundations of reading to the scale-up schools and collect fidelity checks with the outcome of improved student reading
 skills
 -Training on the new reading curriculum for all schools
 -Conduct observations of the delivery of the specially designed instruction (SDI-i.e., special education).
 -Revise the IEP forms to more closely align with the language of the IDEA regulations.
 -Provide professional development in the delivery of SDI that matches the student's unique needs.

6. English Language Learners (ELL) Coaching
 -Provide each ELL Teacher with instruction materials and professional development in assessment, documentation and providing services to
 students

7. Professional Learning Communities (PLC)
 -Collect PLC data on participation of general education and special education in PLC sessions with discussions that include performance of
 students with an IEP. Outcome is improved achievement for all students, but specifically for students with an IEP.

8.Data-based decision making
 -Monitor the submission of SWPs from the scale-up schools. Outcome is to ensure that program services and activities address the needs of
 subgroups such as students with an IEP.

9. Classroom observations -monitoring the fidelity in implementation of evidence-based instructional programs
 -Collect baseline fidelity data on the implementation of the reading curriculum in the scale-up schools with the outcome that teachers are
 implementing the curriculum with fidelity.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

PSS will continue to implement and monitor the infrastructure activities to determine the effectiveness of the current strategies and practices in place.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

With technical assistance provided by the University of Guam Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (Guam CEDDERS), the PSS Special Education Program facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input and involvement in the review and development of the CNMI PART B FFY 2020- FFY 2025 State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2021 Annual Performance Report (APR). Broad stakeholders, inclusive of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, school administrators, special education teachers, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Core Team

reviewed current performance data compared to previous year's performance and national data, where applicable to CNMI's context. In addition, the FFY 2020-2025 SPP and FFY 2021 APR were provided to the newly elected board members for review and input.

This FFY 2021 APR includes current performance data on 15 of the 17 Indicator measures: Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. Per OSEP's instructions, SPP Indicators 4B, 9 and 10 do not apply to the CNMI. For each applicable SPP Indicator measure, CNMI reports FFY 2021 progress data to determine if CNMI met its FFY 2021 targets. An explanation of slippage is provided if CNMI did not meet its target and did not demonstrate improvement from the previous year's performance. A response to any issue identified in the 2022 OSEP SPP/APR Determination letter for CNMI's FFY 2020 SPP/APR is also provided within the related indicators.

Per OSEP's instructions, this FFY 2021 APR includes re-establishing baseline for Indicator 2: Drop-Out Rates because of the change in the required data source. With stakeholder input, inclusive of the State Advisory Panel and secondary special education teachers, CNMI updated the Indicator 2 targets for FFY 2021-FFY 2025, as reflected in the Indicator 2 Data section of this APR.

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

- Conduct annual Parent Summit
- Gather input data from special education teachers
- Continue input sessions with advisory panel members

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

NA

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

NA

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

NA

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions