

VI Part B

FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

2

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

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

As the State Educational Agency (SEA) for the United States Virgin Islands, the Virgin Islands Department of Education, State Office of Special Education (VIDE/SOSE) is responsible for implementing a general supervision system for the Territory that monitors the implementation of the IDEA 2004 Part B program requirements and its accompanying regulations and focuses on improving educational and functional outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. The components of the general supervision communicate and coordinate with each other to form a comprehensive system with each component providing information to and obtaining information from the other components. Each of the eight components is included below:

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report: In 2005, the VIDE/SOSE developed a State Performance Plan (SPP) that serves as an accountability mechanism for the Territory and the two local education agencies' (LEAs) efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEA. This plan, which describes how the Territory will improve implementation over time, currently includes seventeen indicators that provide a measurable indication of the VIDE's performance in specific legal priority areas under Part B. Some of the indicators reflect compliance requirements while others focus on improving results for students with disabilities. For each indicator, the VIDE/SOSE provides the baseline data, targets, and timelines established by the state.

Each year, the VIDE/SOSE reports its performance on the seventeen targets identified in the State Performance Plan (SPP) through the federally mandated Annual Performance Report (APR). Together, the SPP and APR provide a strong foundation for the work of the Virgin Islands Department of Education/State Office of Special Education implementation and purposes of IDEA. In FFY 2013, the SPP and APR was combined into one document and is submitted online in a specially designed platform, GRADS360.

Staff within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned clusters of indicators. The staff is responsible for collecting and analyzing data, creating draft responses, sharing progress with internal staff and external stakeholders, and evaluating implementation for each indicator.

Each year, the VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in the development of the SPP/APR. The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the SPP/APR in the Territory. Panel members review indicator data and assist the VIDE/SOSE in establishing or revising targets for each indicator. Stakeholders have had an important role in the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), which was a new indicator for FFY 2013 and continues to be developed in phases. For the FFY 2015 reporting, Phase III of the SSIP will be reported in Indicator 17.

Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation: The VIDE/SOSE has coordinated the development of the Virgin Islands Department of Education Special Education Rules (VISER), as amended in 2009. These rules are consistent with the requirements of IDEA 2004 and are designed to ensure that all eligible children with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education (FAPE) that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment and independent living ; [34 C.F.R. § 300 .1 (a)] (b)]; ensure that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents are protected; [34 C.F.R. § 300 .1 (b)] (c)]; assist educational agencies in providing for the education of all children with disabilities; [34 C.F.R. § 300 .1 (c)]; and assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities [34 C.F.R. § 300 .1 (d)]. These rules apply to the VIDE, the two LEAs within the Territory, and those public agencies with educational programs and schools.

The VISER provides the foundation for many of the other general supervision responsibilities in the Virgin Islands. For example, the VIDE/SOSE's integrated monitoring system monitors LEAs on the implementation of the requirements set forth in VISER. Within the dispute resolution system, the regulations contained in VISER form the basis for the decisions made as a result of dispute resolution activities such as due process hearings.

In addition to the VISER, the VIDE/SOSE supported the two LEAs in developing territorial Special Education Procedures to support the LEAs in uniformly implementing the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, as Amended in 2004 (IDEIA 2004) and the Virgin Islands Department of Education's Special Education Rules, as Amended in 2009 (VISER). These territorial procedures were developed as an alternative to each district developing procedures on their own. Teachers and administrators within each of the LEAs have been trained on the procedures contained within this procedural manual.

Data on Processes and Results: The VIDE/SOSE has developed a comprehensive data system that enables the Territory to collect, analyze, and report timely and accurate Section 618 and Section 616 data as required by the IDEA. The state has employed a data manager who coordinates all data collection, analysis and reporting requirements within special education. The data manager works closely with staff from the Office of Planning, Research and Development (PR&E), the VIDE office responsible for collecting data based on numerous Federal and Territorial regulations.

In 2001, the VIDE/SOSE purchased GoalView, a comprehensive web-based special education management system which serves as an on-line Individualized Education Program (IEP) system for the LEAs and provides a primary method of collecting Section 618 and Section 616 data for the VIDE/SOSE. The special education data manager has worked diligently with the developers/vendors of this application to customize it for the Virgin Islands. Intensive training and follow-up technical assistance regarding the use of GoalView has been provided to SOSE and to LEA personnel. GoalView has numerous business rules with corresponding built-in edit checks which promote high levels of data quality. GoalView provides data for required public reporting and is also used as a primary data source for all monitoring activities. Each year, the VIDE/SOSE staff conduct on-site monitoring visits in each of the two LEAs to verify that data in GoalView is consistent with information contained in the students' IEPs and associated records. Occasionally, updates are implemented in accordance with the regulation and in consultation with the districts.

Additional data are obtained from PowerSchool, the VIDE's Student Information System (SIS). This comprehensive SIS serves as the primary collection tool

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

for a variety of data collections including, but not limited to, enrollment data, assessment data, attendance data, co-teaching assignments, and discipline events. The State Office of Special Education data manager works with staff from the PR&E to access data needed for special education reporting such as assessment data, enrollment data, and discipline reporting.

The VIDE is currently in the process of finalizing and fully implementing the use of Longitudinal Data System-Virgin Islands Virtual Information System (VIVIS). The special education data manager has been involved in the development of this system and works closely with the director of the Planning Research and Evaluation Division to ensure accurate, valid and continuous data.

Integrated Monitoring: A key component of the VIDE/SOSE’s general supervision system is its integrated monitoring activities. Like other states and territories, the VIDE’s monitoring systems have historically focused on procedural compliance with the IDEA program requirements. However, with a shift in focus on results driven outcomes, VIDE/SOSE in collaboration with other divisions, has instituted several initiatives , specifically, researched based strategies to improve result-focused functional and educational goals for students with disabilities. As a result, there has been a steady improvement in these areas.

In June 2012, the VIDE/SOSE initiated a comprehensive review of the Territory’s Integrated Monitoring System with assistance from the Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC) and the Data Accountability Center (DAC). As a result of this review, the VIDE/SOSE has made substantial revisions to the monitoring system that change from a model of procedural monitoring to one of continuous improvement with a focus on improving student results. Using the concepts of continuous improvement and focused monitoring adopted by the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the VIDE has designed the Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) to promote continuous, equitable educational improvement for students with disabilities (SWD) while ensuring continued procedural compliance.

In this new monitoring system, fidelity of compliant practices is supported using a tiered monitoring approach that enables the VIDE to “monitor” all districts every year. This monitoring is accomplished using a “systematic collection and analysis of data” to document progress and continuous improvement through the provision of technical assistance. **Tier One** monitoring activities are implemented for all districts in the Territory to enforce compliance and improve results. **Tier Two** monitoring activities are implemented for selected districts based on their compliance and/or performance needs, and are either triggered by the previous tier’s data or the state’s monitoring cycle. Typically, **Tier Three’s** monitoring activities are implemented for districts that demonstrate a need for intensive supports to timely correct noncompliance and/or improve results.

The following chart provides a visual representation of monitoring activities conducted at each Tier of the Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System. These differentiated monitoring activities are described in detail in the monitoring manual.

Tier	Monitoring Activities
Tier One (Universal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Data Analysis and Reporting (618 and 616) ·SPP/APR Compliance Indicator Data Verification and Monitoring ·District Determination Status Review ·Dispute Resolution Data
Tier Two (Targeted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Disproportionality Self-assessments (Indicators 4, 9, 10 and Significant Disproportionality) ·Results-driven Focused Monitoring ·Targeted Compliance Monitoring
Tier Three (Intensive)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Compliance Agreement Specified Monitoring Activities

The following descriptions are provided of selected monitoring activities across each of the above Tiers (All components are included in the monitoring manual):

The **Compliance Indicator Desk Audits and On-site Verification Visits (Tier 1)** were initiated in the fall of 2012 to ensure that compliance data collected through the state maintained data base and reported to OSEP via 618 data collections in the Annual Performance Report are valid and reliable. Initially, a desk audit is completed by retrieving and reviewing compliance data available through GoalView and/or PR&E data collections. Data are accessed following the close of the collection period (July 1 through June 30) using a full year of data. During the desk audit, data reports are generated for each indicator for each of the districts. These reports include a list of students for whom data are reported and notations of compliance or noncompliance for the indicator based on the required measurement. The reports are archived for documentation.

Following the completion of the desk audits, on-site verification visits are made to the districts to review student records for a percentage of the students listed on the data report. During the on-site visit, VIDE/SOSE staff review student Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and other pertinent educational records to determine if compliance data reported within GoalView or PR&E data collections are consistent with the documentation maintained within the student’s physical educational records. Procedures and Protocols were developed for the desk audits and for the subsequent on-site verification visits. The procedures and forms are available in the VIDE’s Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System Procedural Manual. If an inconsistency is noted between the data base information and information found in the student’s records, the inconsistency is investigated. Findings are issued if noncompliance is identified. Following the on-site visit, the VIDE/SOSE issues a report to the district that documents the results of the monitoring activity. If findings of noncompliance are identified, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), and the VIDE/SOSE provides technical assistance to the district to assist them both with developing the CAP and to correct the noncompliance. The report includes timelines for ensuring that the district (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State’s data system (e.g., GoalView); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. A letter is issued to the district once correction of the noncompliance has been verified, consistent with both prongs of Memo 09-02, as cited above.

The VIDE/SOSE makes **District Determinations (Tier 1)** as required by the IDEA (34 CFR § 300.600). This regulation requires that states review the data of each local district to evaluate their performance in meeting the requirements and purposes of the IDEA. The VIDE/SOSE develops and publishes district data profiles which compares district performance to the VIDE/SOSE established targets for each of the required SPP/APR Indicators. Based on the information contained in data profiles, information obtained through monitoring visits and other public information, the VIDE/SOSE determines if a district Meets Requirements; Needs Assistance; Needs Intervention; or Needs Substantial Intervention.

District determinations are made annually and the superintendents are notified of the district's determination status. The determinations are discussed with each superintendent, the appropriate deputy superintendent, the respective district director of special education and the Commissioner or Assistant Commissioner. The determination should enable the Districts to develop improvement activities and to incorporate those improvement activities into their LEA Implementation plans. The VIDE/SOSE has developed a new determination rubric that was used in FFY 2013 (July 2014) that is based on compliance indicators and a district’s MOE status.

Self-assessment for Significant Disproportionality (Tier 2) The VIDE/SOSE collects and examines data for each of their districts annually to determine if significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is occurring with respect to:

- the *identification* of children as children with disabilities, including identification of children with particular disabilities; the
- *placement* of children in particular educational environments; and
- the incidence, duration, and types of *disciplinary actions*, including suspensions/expulsions.

Where significant disproportionality is indicated, the VIDE/SOSE requires the districts to review, and, if appropriate, revise its policies, procedures, and practices used in identification, placement, or discipline to ensure that they comply with the requirements of *IDEA*; require the district to publicly report on the 8/3/2017

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

revision of these policies, practices, and procedures; and require the district to reserve up to 15 percent of its Part B funds to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services ("CEIS") to serve children in the district, particularly, but not exclusively, children in those groups that were significantly over-identified, consistent with 34 CFR § 300.646. In the Virgin Islands, the review of district policies, procedures, and practices is accomplished using one or more self-assessments based on the area in which significant disproportionality is identified.

A separate self-assessment was developed for districts identified with significant disproportionality in the placement of students with disabilities. The *Facilitated Self Analysis Assessment for Disproportionate Representation* is used for reviewing policies, procedures, and practices to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements related to the placement of students with disabilities.

Completion of the above self-assessments is considered to be a Tier Two monitoring activity. Districts are provided with a deadline for completing and submitting the self-assessment(s) to the VIDE/SOSE. Upon receipt of the self-assessment, the VIDE/SOSE makes a determination as to whether the district's responses to items within the self-assessment(s) reflect noncompliant policies, procedures and practices related to the regulatory requirements of IDEA related to the identification, placement, and/or discipline of students with disabilities.

In order to verify information included in the district's self-assessment, the VIDE/SOSE selects a sample of records of students with disabilities based on the nature of the significant disproportionality (identification, placement, and/or discipline). Record review forms are available in the VIDE's Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System Procedural Manual.

If noncompliance is found through the self-assessment or the on-site records review, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan, and the VIDE/SOSE provides technical assistance to the district to assist them in correcting the noncompliance. The report includes timelines for ensuring that the district (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. A letter of correction is issued to the district once correction of the noncompliance has been verified consistent with both prongs of OSEP Memo 09-02.

In addition to requiring the review (and, if appropriate) revision of policies, procedures, and practices, the VIDE/SOSE directs any district identified with significant disproportionality to reserve the maximum amount of funds (15%) to be used for comprehensive coordinated early intervening services (CEIS) and requires the district to publicly report on the revision of policies, procedures, and practices. [34 CFR § 300.646(b)(3)].

Results-focused Monitoring- In April 2013, the VIDE/SOSE piloted a new on-site monitoring system that focuses on improving educational results and functional outcomes for students receiving special education and related services, which is aligned with the Department's goals and Education School Improvement Process (eSIP) priorities. The State priorities are to *improve academic achievement; improve school culture; and increase teacher/leader effectiveness*. This results-focused monitoring system is a data-driven process that focuses on a small number of carefully chosen priorities that have the greatest impact on improving results for students with disabilities in critical performance areas such as reading and math achievement. The focus of the monitoring is to examine the district's compliance with federal and state special education requirements specifically related to the performance area and to identify improvement activities that can be implemented to correct any identified noncompliance and improve student academic performance.

Prior to the on-site visit, VIDE/SOSE staff conducts phone interviews with randomly selected parents of students with special need in order to determine their perspective as it relates to ways of improving the focus area for monitoring. During the on-site monitoring visit, VIDE/SOSE staff also conducts interviews with school personnel that work directly with our students. VIDE/SOSE staff reviews district compliance and results data to determine areas of low performance and compliance. Then, in collaboration with district special education and general education leadership, a focus area for monitoring is identified to address the low performance. Additional data is collected related to the focus area to determine the root cause of the low performance of students with disabilities. Interviews are also conducted with parents of students with disabilities to determine their concerns about the performance of their children.

During the on-site visit, teacher and administrator interviews, classroom observations, and record reviews are conducted to gather information about current practices and resources and to identify areas of noncompliance that may be contributing to the low performance. In addition, a parent forum is held to obtain additional parent input. The root cause of the poor performance is identified, and strategies for improvement are discussed.

Following the on-site visit, the VIDE/SOSE issues a report to the district that documents findings of noncompliance. The district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), and the VIDE/SOSE provides technical assistance to the district to assist them both with developing the CAP and to correct the noncompliance. The report includes timelines for ensuring that the district (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State's data system (e.g., GoalView); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. A letter is issued to the district once correction of the noncompliance has been verified, consistent with both prongs of Memo 09-02, as cited above.

In this new monitoring system, one district is monitored each year and technical assistance and professional development are provided to the district during the following year to assist the district staff in implementing improvement activities to address improved performance and compliance.

Districts are selected for **Targeted Compliance Monitoring (Tier 2)** when compliance issues or concerns emerge based on Tier One monitoring activities (e.g. Data Analysis and Reporting (618 and 616); SPP/APR Compliance Indicator Data Verification and Monitoring; District Determination Status Review; and Dispute Resolution Data Review). Targeted Compliance Monitoring may occur when compliance issues or concerns emerge based on other Tier Two monitoring activities including Disproportionality Self-assessments (Indicators 4, 9, 10 and Significant Disproportionality) and Results-driven Focused Monitoring.

When a district is selected for Targeted Compliance Monitoring, the district superintendent and the district director of special education will be informed in writing of the pending monitoring activity. Based on the nature of the issue that arises, desk audits will be conducted to obtain data relevant to the area of concern. On-site monitoring visits by VIDE/SOSE staff may also be required to gather additional information.

Following the on-site visit, the VIDE/SOSE issues a report to the district that documents findings of noncompliance. The district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), and the VIDE/SOSE provides technical assistance to the district to assist them both with developing the CAP and to correct the noncompliance. The report includes timelines for ensuring that the district (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State's data system (e.g., GoalView); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. A letter is issued to the district once correction of the noncompliance has been verified, consistent with both prongs of Memo 09-02, as cited above.

Tier Three's monitoring activities are implemented for districts that demonstrate a need for intensive supports to timely correct noncompliance and/or improve results. Currently, the VIDE does not have any districts identified for Tier Three Monitoring.

Dispute Resolution: The VIDE/SOSE manages a dispute resolution system that ensures timely and effective resolution of disputes related to IDEA requirements through a variety of means including mediation, complaint investigation and due process hearings. The VIDE/SOSE has established procedures that essentially mimic the Federal regulations for each of the dispute resolution processes and has assigned a staff member to coordinate these processes.

Complaints and Related Investigations – VIDE/SOSE encourages parents and family members to work with schools to resolve differences. When differences cannot be resolved, a written complaint can be filed with the VIDE/SOSE alleging the violation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) procedures. Any organization or individual may file a signed written complaint. If the LEA is found in non-compliance, a letter of findings specifies the required corrective action(s) that the LEA must complete as soon as possible, but no later than one year. The VIDE/SOSE dispute resolution staff follow-up with districts to ensure that correction occurs.

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

Due Process Hearings – The VIDE/SOSE has established procedures to provide due process hearings for issues related to the identification, evaluation, educational placement or provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to a child with a disability. The VIDE/SOSE has assigned a staff member who oversees the processing of due process requests and the appointments of impartial hearing officers. Within 15 days of receiving notice of the parent's due process complaint (seven days if the complaint is expedited), and before the initiation of a due process hearing, the LEA must convene a resolution meeting with the parent and the relevant members of the IEP team who have specific knowledge of the facts identified in the complaint. The purpose of this meeting is to provide an opportunity for informal resolution of the dispute that is the basis for the complaint. If the resolution meeting is unsuccessful, The VIDE/SOSE offers mediation to the parties if both parties agree to undertake the process. The VIDE/SOSE provides mediation to the parties to a due process request if both parties agree to undertake the process, including offering to have a mediator conduct the resolution session. If the due process request is not resolved through informal dispute resolution, the request goes forward to a due process hearing before an impartial hearing officer, who issues a decision within the timelines set by IDEA. A party can appeal the impartial hearing officer's decision to a state-level review officer. Further appeals are taken by filing a civil action in state or federal court.

Mediation - Mediation is a voluntary process for resolving disputes between two parties that can be used when both sides agree to mediate. This process is facilitated by a trained, impartial third-party mediator, who helps the parties communicate with each other about their concerns in an effort to reach a mutually acceptable solution.

Fiscal: Special Education and related services in the Virgin Islands are funded primarily through IDEA funds and the Virgin Islands General Fund. The bulk of funds flow to the two LEAs within the Territory. There are no charter schools for Educational Service Agencies in the Virgin Islands.

Each LEA submits a proposed budget to the VIDE/SOSE based on a funding formula. Applications go through a programmatic and fiscal review process at the VIDE/SOSE. Reviews are also conducted by the Federal Grants office. These reviews include checks for allowable costs and other Federal and Territory fiscal requirements. Once approved, the budget goes to Budget Control to enter it into the system. Final approval is made by the third party fiduciary. LEAs are then informed that their budgets are approved and that the funds are available for use. The LEAs are given 27 months to expend funds which are monitored regularly to ensure that funds are submitted appropriately and in a timely manner.

Technical Assistance and Professional Learning: The VIDE/SOSE provides differentiated technical assistance to LEAs to support them in meeting the regulatory requirements of IDEA and to assist them in implementing programs and practices that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Information is shared via email, conference calls, and face-to-face meetings. General, targeted, and intensive technical assistance is provided based on the data and needs of the LEAs. Additional information about the VIDE/SOSE system of technical assistance is included in the separate item for technical assistance.

The Virgin Islands Department of Education/State Office of Special Education (VIDE/SOSE) maintains a comprehensive system of professional development that strikes a balance between improving compliant practices related to the regulatory requirements of IDEA and supporting educators in the implementation of evidence-based practices that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Professional development is provided by VIDE/SOSE, technical assistance providers from OSEP-funded centers, and private consultants. Most professional learning occurs in face-to-face professional development sessions; however, the VIDE/SOSE and the two LEAs have invested heavily in technology (e.g. DirectStep) that makes on-line learning easily accessible for teachers and administrators. Professional learning communities are established at many schools and provide a great avenue for sharing information with teachers and administrators. Additional information about the VIDE/SOSE system of professional development is included in the separate item for professional development.

Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions: The VIDE/SOSE has the authority to ensure compliance with IDEA and Territory regulations and procedures. When noncompliance is identified related to any of the regulatory requirements, findings are issued and the LEA is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan to document the activities that will be completed to correct the noncompliance. Timelines for correction and necessary evidences of correction are also specified.

VIDE/SOSE provides technical assistance to the district to assist them with developing the CAP and with implementing the activities needed to correct the noncompliance. The report includes timelines for correction of noncompliance. In order for any noncompliance to be considered corrected the LEA must ensure that it is meeting both prongs of Memo 09-02. This includes evidence that the district (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the State's data system (e.g., GoalView); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. A letter is issued to the district once correction of the noncompliance has been verified, consistent with both prongs of Memo 09-02, as cited above.

In addition to the Corrective Action Plan, the VIDE/SOSE provides targeted technical assistance to the district to support them in correcting noncompliance. When noncompliance is more systemic or longstanding, the technical assistance becomes more intensive. Sanctions can be applied if indicated. In addition, professional development for LEA personnel is a means of achieving improvement. Because many educators and administrators have difficulty accessing professional development on the mainland, the VIDE/SOSE has funded high quality professional development on-island. Topics addressed during these sessions have included job-embedded instructional strategies, suspension and expulsion, improving instruction in the general education core curriculum, positive schoolclimate with tiered discipline interventions, and supporting compliant practices in secondary transition.

The VIDE/SOSE's general supervision system strikes a balance between compliance and results. As a component of its SSIP, the VIDE/SOSE will be implementing the results of the ongoing evaluation of the strategies in the SSIP phase III designed to improve results for students with disabilities ultimately achieving the VIDE/SOSE SiMR.

Conclusion: As the State Educational Agency (SEA) for the United States Virgin Islands, the Virgin Islands Department of Education, State Office of Special Education (VIDE/SOSE) has implemented a general supervision system for the Territory that monitors the implementation of the (IDEA) Part B program requirements and its accompanying regulations and focuses on improving educational and functional outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the VIDE/SOSE continues to work with its internal and external stakeholders to improve the VIDE/SOSE general supervision system and leverage resources to support improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

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 LEAs.

The Virgin Islands Department of Education/State Office of Special Education (VIDE/SOSE) provides differentiated technical assistance to LEAs to support them in meeting the regulatory requirements of IDEA and to assist them in implementing programs and practices that lead to improved outcomes for students

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
with disabilities. Information is shared via email, conference calls, and face-to-face meetings.

General technical assistance is provided to administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and other educational personnel in both LEAs on topics that impact special education in general. These TAs include VIDE/SOSE's special education management system (Goalview), local budget applications, and specific Indicators or areas of concern. LEAs also reserve the right to request additional TA in identified areas of need. The Virgin Islands Department of Education provides a portal to SOSE on their main website where information is posted for public viewing.

Targeted technical assistance is based on district data and needs, and it is more customized than general technical assistance. The VIDE/SOSE uses LEA data from the SPP/APR indicators as well as other monitoring activities to identify technical assistance needs. Participation in targeted technical assistance activities may be voluntary, but participation may also be required as in the case of targeted technical assistance that is required as a part of an LEA's Corrective Action Plan that is developed secondary to the identification of noncompliance. In the past year, one district has received targeted technical assistance related to meeting the secondary transition requirements reported in Indicator 13 of the SPP/APR.

Additionally, each LEA (e.g. administrators, special education supervisors and counselors) were provided with resources that were created in-house, relative to Indicator 4 Suspension/Expulsion. These resources are a quick reference guide that provide a brief overview of the discipline procedures under IDEA 2004 along with an accompanying checklist outlining the various steps that must occur when a student with disability is being suspended/expelled.

During the past three (3) school years and this year, VIDE/SOSE staff and independent consultants have been working on two (2) major initiatives, Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports (PBIS) with personnel from both districts. The St. Thomas/St. John LEA has implemented RTI in all elementary and junior high schools and has switched to the St. Croix District to implement RTI in all elementary and junior high schools. The St. Croix LEA has staff working with school teams to implement PBIS in all the elementary schools and junior high schools. With the assistance of the Territorial PBIS Team, the PBIS Consultant has begun implementation events to support both the elementary and junior high schools in the St. Thomas/St. John District. This technical assistance includes a variety of on-site supports including coaching and modeling.

Intensive technical assistance is provided in those instances when egregious, on-going noncompliance has not been corrected or when the district needs intensive supports in order to implement programs and practices designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. In those instances where intensive technical assistance is required, the LEA and the VIDE/SOSE will jointly develop an action plan that outlines the required activities and sets out a structure and timeline for monitoring those activities.

In order to provide technical assistance to districts, the VIDE/SOSE has consulted with technical assistance providers from a variety of federally-funded technical assistance centers such as the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) formerly the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center, the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)-WestED, and the IDEA Data Center (IDC) to obtain information and resources that can be used in the provision of technical assistance to LEAs. Having access to these national experts has been very helpful to the VIDE/SOSE.

VIDE/SOSE has been working intensely with National Center for Systemic Improvement(NCSI)-WestED and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), to complete Phase III of its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). As part of this plan, the SOSE has continued to work collaboratively with internal and external agencies and stakeholders in identifying supports and resources to improve the implementation of evidence-based practices to improve reading proficiency.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

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

The Virgin Islands Department of Education/State Office of Special Education (VIDE/SOSE) maintains a comprehensive system of professional development that strikes a balance between improving compliant practices related to the regulatory requirements of IDEA and supporting educators in the implementation of evidence-based practices that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Professional development is provided by VIDE/SOSE's team, technical assistance providers from OSEP-funded centers, and private consultants. Most professional learning occurs in face-to-face professional development sessions; however, the VIDE/SOSE and the two LEAs have invested heavily in technology (e.g. DirectStep) that makes on-line learning easily accessible for teachers and administrators. Professional learning communities are established at many schools and provide a great avenue for sharing information with teachers and administrators.

A great emphasis in professional development workshops have been on the compliance and results indicators included in the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). Each year VIDE/SOSE reviewed the data reported in the SPP/APR and planned professional development(PD) based on the results of this analysis. For example, for the past few years intensive training has been on suspension and expulsion (Indicator 4A and 4B) and Transition (Indicator 13). As a result, data regarding correction of noncompliance for Indicator 4 has improved as well as Transition (Indicator 13) components, thus ensuring that students with disabilities are not being suspended more often than not; and students have effective transition plans implemented timely and correctly. VIDE/SOSE continues to provide PD to school administrators and pertinent staff, through its Administrators' Leadership Academy to effectively train administrators on the mandates of suspension and expulsion of a student with disabilities. This training is conducted by a Special Education Law Attorney.

For years, a significant amount of professional development has focused on meeting the requirements related to secondary transition as reported in Indicator 13. SOSE staff obtained training from the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), and then customized this training for district personnel. SOSE was able to work diligently to provide professional development to teachers and other school based personnel in each LEA related to this indicator. As a result, the LEAs have been able to correct all instances of noncompliance, and the VIDE/SOSE is reporting significantly improved data in the FFY2015 SPP/APR. However, and more importantly, SOSE was able to provide best practices initiatives that are instrumental in ensuring consistent

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
improvement of Indicator 13, and overall improved student outcomes.

The VIDE/SOSE has shifted its emphasis to professional learning activities that focus on improving results for students with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE has partnered with staff from other VIDE divisions and the two LEAs to implement many of these activities. The following section provides a brief overview of many of the results-related professional development activities:

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments - The VIDE adopted new statewide assessments for the 2014-2015 school year. The Smarter Balanced interim and summative assessments were administered in ELA and mathematics for students taking the regular assessment. Students with severe cognitive disabilities participated in the National Center and State Collaborative interim and summative assessments. The SOSE has worked with colleagues from the Curriculum Instruction and Assessment Offices during the development of these assessments and are providing professional development to teachers of students with disabilities to support the administration of these assessments. For example, VIDE/SOSE staff has been engaged in providing training on the use of accommodations in assessment and instruction for those students participating in the Smarter Balanced assessments.

The VIDE/SOSE has partnered with leadership in the St. Thomas/St. John District to implement Response to Intervention (RtI). Initially, the roll-out began in six pilot schools (elementary). At the ending of the 2015-2016 school year, RTI was implemented in all elementary and junior high schools in the St. Thomas/St. John District. During the 2015-2016 school year, RTI was also rolled-out to all elementary and junior high schools in the St. Croix District. Consultants from the American Institutes of Research (AIR) are providing job-embedded professional learning with follow-up coaching and technical assistance.

The VIDE/SOSE has worked with an independent consultant and LEA leadership to implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in all the elementary and junior high schools in the St. Croix District. . Currently, the implementation of PBIS by the same independent contractor and the VIDE Territorial PBIS Team began the roll-out of PBIS St. Thomas/St. John District. Professional development with school teams has been on-going, and follow-up technical assistance at the school level addresses implementation barriers in a timely manner. A SOSE staff member is a member of the state team and is responsible for coordinating many of the PBIS related activities.

Professional development will also play an important role in the implementation of the VIDE/SOSE's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The VIDE/SOSE has met with internal and external stakeholders and are currently working on the development of Phase III, which will evaluate the resources and supports implemented for improved outcomes.

As the VIDE/SOSE continues to focus on improving results for students with disabilities, it is important to build the capacity of the SOSE to provide high quality professional development in a variety of areas. The VIDE leadership has provided opportunities for VIDE/SOSE to participate in off-island training on a variety of topics and has supported the practice of bringing in consultants as needed, to conduct professional development. It is important to note that as the VIDE/SOSE expands its current professional development initiatives and introduces new ones, a primary focus will be on building the capacity of the state to provide training and coaching, and to put in place structures that promote sustainability.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

The Virgin Islands Department of Education, State Office of Special Education (VIDE/SOSE) seeks input from stakeholders on a variety of topics.

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, include parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, and teachers and administrators. The panel also includes individuals from other private and public agencies involved in the education of children with disabilities. The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities.

Stakeholder input for the VIDE/SOSE's FFY 2015 State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for all the indicators was provided by a Stakeholder Group at its January 2017 meeting. Stakeholders reviewed data for the past years, FFY 2013 and FFY 2014, and actual data for FFY 2015, and provided suggestions for targets for FFY 2015- 2018.

In order to develop a SSIP that is designed to truly improve results for students with disabilities, the VIDE/SOSE has engaged numerous internal and external stakeholders in developing the SSIP. Internal stakeholders included VIDE Leadership that engaged in the development of the Department's Strategic Plan and other VIDE consultants from Curriculum and Instruction, English as a Second Language, and Technology. External stakeholders included parents of children with disabilities, teachers, school administrators, district administrators of special education, and district curriculum coordinators. Multiple meetings including these external and internal stakeholders have been held to address all Phase I SSIP requirements and SSIP Phase II. This reporting year, VIDE/SOSE will engage a special group of internal and external stakeholders from agencies that will support and implement the initiatives outlined in the SSIP.

In the past, VIDE/SOSE also received input from stakeholders after the completion of focused monitoring activities. Two parent forums were held for parents to discuss their concerns about educational services for students with disabilities. Parent are also asked to provide input into the contributing factors to poor achievement for students with disabilities and to assist in identifying appropriate services and supports that can be used to support academic achievement.

The VIDE/SOSE also welcomes input from stakeholders on an informal basis. The VIDE maintains office in the St. Croix District as well as in the St. Thomas/St. John District. VIDE/SOSE receives and respond to numerous phone calls from parents and other interested individuals on a daily basis.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

The State's SPP/APR and LEAs FFY 2014 performance for Public Reporting of each LEA is located on the Virgin Islands web portal www.vide.vi homepage by first clicking the *Our Divisions tab*, then clicking on *Special Education*.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2015 and 2016 is Needs Assistance.

In the State's 2016 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 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.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

The State's 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.

Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B 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 B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			6.00%	8.00%	77.00%	19.00%	22.00%	24.00%	26.00%	29.00%	32.00%
Data		5.33%	7.29%	8.00%	76.00%	19.00%	37.40%	30.26%	43.80%	47.79%	41.49%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	35.00%	38.00%	41.00%	44.00%

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
			null	45
			null	93
				Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

The VIDE/SOSE reported data for this indicator is the same used under Title 1 of the ESEA. The Planning, Research, and Evaluation Division is the VIDE Division responsible for collecting the data from schools on graduation, assessment, exit, and discipline. For FFY 2015 cohort rate data reported for students with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma, the VIDE/SOSE in lieu of not having the prepopulated data used the same data collection measurement that provided a basis for youth graduating in the (4) year cohort for school year 2014-2015. The VIDE/SOSE used the number of students with disabilities exiting education by graduation with a regular diploma in the 4 year cohort for school year 2014-2015 as the numerator to determine the four (4) year graduation rate. The data reported in the denominator for this indicator is the number of students who graduated in FFY 2015 (school year 2014-2015) who for the first time entered 9th grade + students who transfer in, - students who transfer out (die or emigrated) during school years 2011-2012 + 2012-2013 + 2013-2014 + 2014-2015 (including the summer of 2015). The VIDE/SOSE is committed to providing valid and reliable data for this and all indicators and continues to work closely with PRE in this end.

Explanation of Data Discrepancy

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

The VIDE/SOSE reported data for this indicator is the same used under Title 1 of the ESEA. The data reported in the denominator for this indicator is the number of students who graduated in FFY 2015 (school year 2014-2015) who for the first time entered 9th grade + students who transfer in, - students who transfer out (die or emigrated) during school years 2011-2012 + 2012-2013 + 2013-2014 + 2014-2015 (including the summer of 2015).

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
45	93	41.49%	35.00%	48.39%

Graduation Conditions Field

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

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

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

State requirements to graduate with a regular diploma:

The requirements for all students to graduate with a high school diploma, including students with disabilities, are as follows: students must earn a minimum of **26 Carnegie units** from grades 9-12. Twenty one (21) of the Carnegie units must be earned in specific required courses, delineated below, and the other 5 Carnegie units are earned in elective courses. All students must achieve a grade of 70% or better in each required course and in each elective to earn course credit (or Carnegie units) toward graduation with a high school diploma. Students are required to complete 100 hours of community service in order to graduate.

The specific course requirements for graduation are:

English – 4 Carnegie Units

Science, including General Science and Biology – 3 Carnegie Units

Mathematics, including Algebra and Geometry – 3 Carnegie Units

Social Studies, including Virgin Islands History, Caribbean History,
and U.S. History – (1 Carnegie Unit per course for a total of 3 Carnegie Units)

Foreign Language (Spanish or French) – 2 Carnegie Units

Computer Science – 1 Carnegie Unit

Physical Education – 2 Carnegie Units

Health – 1 Carnegie Unit

Home Economics or Industrial Arts – 1 Carnegie Unit

Developmental Reading/ Developmental Writing or Speech – 1 Carnegie Unit

Electives – 5 Carnegie Units

CALCUATIONS

Using the FFY 2014(school 2014-2015) data as required, 45 of 93 (48.39%) students with disabilities in the 4 year cohort group graduated from high school with a regular diploma.

The VIDE used the four year adjusted cohort graduation rate, as required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), to determine the graduation rate for students with disabilities. The calculation for determining the number of students with disabilities who graduate with a regular diploma is as follows:

(Numerator): # of students with disabilities in the 4 year cohort who earn a regular high school diploma through the summer of 2015

(divided by) $45 \div 93 \times 100 = 48.39\%$

(Denominator): # of first time 9th graders with disabilities who enter

in the fall (of 2011)

+ students who transfer in,

- students who transfer out (die or emigrate)

during school years 2011-2012 + 2012-2013 + 2013-2014 + 2014-2015 (including the summer of 2015).

Calculation: $45 \div 93 \times 100 = 48.39\%$

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			9.00%	6.00%	4.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	4.50%	4.50%
Data		10.91%	10.51%	5.81%	4.59%	4.82%	4.60%	9.79%	8.60%	10.18%	10.92%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.25%	4.00%	3.75%	3.75%

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 youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
31	622	10.92%	4.25%	4.98%

Use a different calculation methodology

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

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

The VIDE/SOSE used the same calculation that was used for FFY 2014, as permitted, by OSEP Memorandum 14-2.

of students with IEP's (ages 14-21) who exited due to dropping out _____
X 100=%

of students with IEP's ages (14-21) who are enrolled

Calculation: 31÷622×100= 4.98%

In FFY 2015, 31 out of 622 (4.98%) youth with IEPs dropped out of high school.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

--

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100%

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

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes No

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AYP	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2	null	null		50.00%	

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2008	Target ≥			95.00%	97.00%	92.70%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%
			Data			100%	97.00%	92.70%	81.00%	97.40%	98.83%	97.67%	98.56%	95.05%
Math	A Overall	2008	Target ≥			95.00%	97.00%	92.70%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%
			Data			100%	97.00%	92.70%	81.00%	97.40%	98.83%	97.76%	98.56%	94.65%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.50%	96.00%	96.00%	96.50%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.50%	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

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/15/2016

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	71	77	80	84	119	116	n	n	73	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	59	64	62	65	90	84			54		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	12	13	18	19	29	32			19		

Data Source: SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/15/2016

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	67	66	72	75	93	96	n	n	60	n	n

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

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	59	62	62	68	78	82			52		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	8	n	10	7	15	14			8	n	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	620	620	95.05%	95.50%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	529	529	94.65%	95.50%	100%

Public Reporting Information

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

The State Report Card which provides assessment and graduation information consistent with Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is available on the Virgin Islands Virtual Information System (VIVIS) under reports tab K-12. The 2015-2016 Report Card is available for public view at <https://vivisdata.vi.gov/VIVISLanding.aspx?oid=0>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

For FFY 2015 (SY 15-16) the State addressed the data reporting issues identified during the U.S. Department of Education's recent review of the VIDE/SOSE's IDEA Assessment data by resubmitting the data on February 28, 2017, prior to the March 1, 2017 submission deadline. Additionally, the State addressed additional issues reported in the EDFacts 15-16 verification report on April 4, 2017, prior to the April 12, 2017 deadline. See attached EDFacts OSEP reports (OSEP 0040 through 0045) participation and proficiency reports with the counts of children with IEPs taking the regular assessment with accommodations.

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Public Reporting

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

The State Report Card which provides assessment and graduation information consistent with Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is available on the Virgin Islands Department of Education's Home Page (www.vide.vi). Listed below are the steps to access the data relative to the public reporting.

For MAC and PC users access website through Internet Explorer Microsoft Edge, Mozilla Firefox and or Google Chrome.

1. Select "Our Division" Tabs
2. Select Planning Research and Evaluation
3. Click on the Virgin Islands Report Card tab
4. Click on Transitional Report Card (2014-15 and 2015-16 Report Card)

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

5. Should see displayed Current k-12 Reports/Transitional Report Card
6. Click on # 3 Assessment Participation Rate
7. Click on # 4 Assessment Proficiency Rate
8. Access can also be gained by copying and pasting in your web browser

<https://vivi.vi.gov/zAnalyticsPublicCurrentK12TransitionalReportCard.aspx>

Listed below are the steps to access the data relative to copying and pasting the link above in your web browser.

1. Select *K-12 Reports* button on the VIVIS Home Page
2. *Click on* Transitional Report Card (2014-15 and 2015-16 Report Card)
3. *Arrive at* Current K-12 Reports/Transitional Report Card
4. *Click on* 3. Assessment Participation Rate
5. *Click on* Assessment Proficiency Rate

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2015 publicly-reported assessment results.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2008	Target ≥				33.00%	38.20%	52.90%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%
			Data				13.32%	11.64%	14.90%	24.10%	20.29%	21.95%	14.29%	8.68%
Math	A Overall	2008	Target ≥				33.00%	38.20%	54.50%	54.50%	52.90%	52.90%	52.90%	52.90%
			Data				20.84%	19.90%	7.90%	32.60%	28.10%	27.83%	23.86%	7.77%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%
Math	A ≥ Overall	52.90%	52.90%	52.90%	52.90%

Key:

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/15/2016

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	71	77	80	84	119	116	n	n	73	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	n	n	n	n	n	n					
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	8	6	11	8	8	6			8		

Data Source: SY 2015-16 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/15/2016

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

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	67	66	72	75	93	96	n	n	60	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	n	n		n	n	n					
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	n	n	7	n	6	7			n		

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	620	68	8.68%	54.50%	10.97%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	529	42	7.77%	52.90%	7.94%

Public Reporting Information

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

The State Report Card which provides assessment and graduation information consistent with Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is available on the Virgin Islands Virtual Information System (VIVIS) under reports tab K-12. The 2015-2016 Report Card is available for public view at:

<https://vividata.vi.gov/VIVISLanding.aspx?oid=0>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

For FFY 2015 (SY 15-16) the State addressed the data reporting issues identified during the U.S. Department of Education's recent review of the VIDE/SOSE's IDEA Assessment data by resubmitting the data on February 28, 2017, prior to the March 1, 2017 submission deadline. Additionally, the State addressed additional issues reported in the EDFacts 15-16 verification report on April 4, 2017, prior to the April 12, 2017 deadline. See attached EDFacts OSEP reports (OSEP 0040 through 0045) participation and proficiency reports with the counts of children with IEPs taking the regular assessment with accommodations.

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Public Reporting

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

The State Report Card which provides assessment and graduation information consistent with Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is available on the Virgin Islands Department of Education's Home Page (www.vide.vi). Listed below are the steps to access the data relative to the public reporting.

For MAC and PC users access website through Internet Explorer Microsoft Edge, Mozilla Firefox and or Google Chrome.

1. Select "Our Division" Tabs

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

2. Select Planning Research and Evaluation
3. Click on the Virgin Islands Report Card tab
4. Click on Transitional Report Card (2014-15 and 2015-16 Report Card)
5. Should see displayed Current k-12 Reports/Transitional Report Card
6. Click on # 3 Assessment Participation Rate
7. Click on # 4 Assessment Proficiency Rate
8. Access can also be gained by copying and pasting in your web browser

<https://vivi.gov/zAnalyticsPublicCurrentK12TransitionalReportCard.aspx>

Listed below are the steps to access the data relative to copying and pasting the link above in your web browser.

1. Select *K-12 Reports* button on the VIVIS Home Page
2. *Click on* Transitional Report Card (2014-15 and 2015-16 Report Card)
3. *Arrive at* Current K-12 Reports/Transitional Report Card
4. *Click on* 3. Assessment Participation Rate
5. *Click on* Assessment Proficiency Rate

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2015 publicly-reported assessment results.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data			0%	50.00%	50.00%	0%	50.00%	0%	100%	0%	0%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

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

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	2	0%	50.00%	0%

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The VIDE/SOSE defines significant discrepancy by using a rate ratio methodology that compares the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities in each LEA to the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for all children within that same LEA. A significant discrepancy exists when the rate ratio is 2.0 or greater. The VIDE/SOSE does not use a minimum "n" size and includes all students with disabilities in all grades within each of the two districts. A minimum "n" is not used for Indicator 4A.

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

The VIDE/SOSE uses the enrollment data from the Department of Education, Division of Planning Research and Evaluation (PRE) for school year 2014-2015 (dated September 30, 2014) and the 618 annual child count data collected on December 1, 2014 (SY 2014-2015) and reported for all children with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE also utilized the data reported via EDfacts (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2014-2015.

For FFY 2015 the State conducted a desk audit and onsite monitoring for students suspended for greater than 10 days in the school year of 2014-2015 and determined the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR 300.170(b). Therefore, the State did not identify nor issue any findings of non-compliance for this indicator.

The VIDE/SOSE uses the enrollment data from the Department of Education, Division of Planning Research and Evaluation (PR&E) for school year

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

2015-2016 (dated September 30, 2015) and the 618 annual child count data collected and reported for all school age children with disabilities on December 1, 2015. The VIDE/SOSE also utilized the data reported via EDfacts (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2014-2015.

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.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

For FFY 2015 the State conducted a desk audit and onsite monitoring of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the school year of 2014-2015 and determined that the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR 300.170(b). Therefore, the State did not identify or issue any findings of non-compliance for this indicator.

The VIDE/SOSE did not issue any findings of noncompliance with Part B requirements for this indicator thus, a review of the districts' policies, procedures and practices was not required.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 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

In describing its definition for "significant discrepancy" and methodology, the State reported, consistent with the measurement table, that it "uses the enrollment data from the Department of Education, Division of Planning Research and Evaluation (PRE) for school year 2014-2015 (dated September 30, 2014) and the 618 annual child count data collected on December 1, 2014 (SY 2014-2015) and reported for all children with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE also utilized the data reported via EDfacts (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2014-2015. However, the State also provided narrative, which OSEP believes the State included in its preclarification submission, which indicates that 2015-2016 data was used for this indicator. OSEP will accept the definition of "significant discrepancy" that was provided in the State's final submission for this indicator.

Required Actions

In its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must confirm that, for this indicator, it used SY 2014-2015 data in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR.

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	50.00%	0%	0%	50.00%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2	0	2	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The VIDE/SOSE defines significant discrepancy by using a rate ratio methodology that compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities by race and ethnicity in each District to the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for all children within the same District.

A District will be considered to have "significant discrepancy" when the (1) ratio of the District's suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities from any racial or ethnic group is at a rate of 2.0 or higher than the suspension/expulsion rate for all children without disabilities in that same district, and (2) the District's policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral intervention and supports, and procedural safeguards. The VIDE does not utilize a minimum "n" size.

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

The VIDE/SOSE uses the enrollment data from the Department of Education, Division of Planning Research and Evaluation (PRE) for school year 2014-2015 (dated September 30, 2014) for the district comparison group and the 618 annual child count data collected on December 1, 2014 (SY 2014-2015) and reported for all children with disabilities ages 3 through 21. The VIDE/SOSE also utilized the data reported via EDfacts (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2014-2015.

For FFY 2015 the State conducted a desk audit and onsite monitoring of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the school year of 2014-2015 and determined that the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR 300.170(b). Therefore, the State did not issue any findings of non-compliance for this indicator.

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

The VIDE/SOSE uses the enrollment data from the Department of Education, Division of Planning Research and Evaluation (PRE) for school year

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

2014-2015 (dated September 30, 2014) for the district comparison group and the 618 annual child count data collected on December 1, 2014 (SY 2014-2015) and reported for all children with disabilities ages 3 through 21. The VIDE/SOSE also utilized the data reported via EDfacts (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2014-2015.

The VIDE utilized the data collected on Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-0621 (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2014-2015 due December 1, 2015 ("618 data"). The enrollment data from PR&E for school year 2014-2015 (dated September 30, 2015) are utilized for the district comparison group. The 618 data are reported for all children with disabilities ages 3 through 21.

Based on the calculations, both districts were found to have a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rates of suspensions or expulsions of students with disabilities for African American/Black students when compared to overall suspensions/expulsion rates within that same district. As a result of having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days for African American/Black students, both districts were required to complete a Facilitated Self-Analysis Guide on their implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, practices or procedures comply with IDEA. The State Office of Special Education reviewed the Districts' responses on the self-analysis as well as reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of both districts relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards, and has determined that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR 300.170(b) and did not contribute to significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for African American/Black students with disabilities.

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.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

For FFY 2015 the State conducted a desk audit and onsite monitoring for students suspended for greater than 10 days in the school year of 2014-2015 and determined the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR 300.170(b). Therefore, the State did not identify nor issue any findings of non-compliance for this indicator.

During the on-site monitoring conducted by the VIDE/SOSE in both district in June 2016, the State reviewed the policies, procedures, and practices of both districts relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards and has determined that the Local Educational Agency (LEA) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (achieved 100%) and as such, no noncompliance was identified. 34 CFR §§300.170(a) and 300.530.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 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

In describing its definition for "significant discrepancy" and methodology, the State reported, consistent with the measurement table, that it "uses the enrollment data from the Department of Education, Division of Planning Research and Evaluation (PRE) for school year 2014-2015 (dated September 30, 2014) and the 618 annual child count data collected on December 1, 2014 (SY 2014-2015) and reported for all children with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE also utilized the data reported via EDfacts (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2014-2015." However, the State also provided narrative, which OSEP believes the State included in its preclarification submission, which indicates that 2015-2016 data was used for this indicator. OSEP will accept the definition of "significant discrepancy" that was provided in the State's final submission for this

Required Actions

In its FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must confirm that, for this indicator, it used SY 2014-2015 data in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR.

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			33.00%	36.00%	36.00%	41.00%	47.00%	47.00%	48.00%	50.00%	51.00%
		Data		40.59%	34.87%	34.88%	34.88%	46.70%	51.86%	55.24%	61.35%	56.44%	55.25%
B	2005	Target ≤			21.00%	21.00%	21.00%	16.00%	23.00%	22.00%	21.00%	20.50%	20.50%
		Data		21.00%	26.12%	26.12%	23.91%	24.90%	19.47%	17.45%	17.14%	20.16%	20.73%
C	2005	Target ≤			3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.05%	3.05%
		Data		3.00%	3.00%	2.56%	3.06%	3.59%	4.35%	3.44%	4.20%	2.88%	2.67%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	56.00%
Target B ≤	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Target C ≤	3.05%	3.05%	3.05%	2.95%

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 (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	1,075	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	585	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	187	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	18	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	20	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	585	1,075	55.25%	52.00%	54.42%

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

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	187	1,075	20.73%	20.00%	17.40%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	38	1,075	2.67%	3.05%	3.53%

Explanation of C Slippage

During FFY 2015 (December 1, 2015 child count data) the number of school aged children ages six (6) through twenty-one (21) in separate schools, residential facilities or homebound/hospital placement increased, as the IEP teams agreed that the academic and functional needs of these children were unable to be met in Measurement A or B. As such, services in Measurement C of this particular indicator was the most appropriate setting, which captures the number of school aged children with IEPs ages six (6) through twenty-one (21) inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Measurement A: During FFY 2015 five hundred and eighty five (585) out of one thousand seventy-five (1,075) or (54.42%) of children and youths with disabilities ages six (6) through twenty (21) were in the regular class for more than 80% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE *met and exceeded the target for FFY 2015* of 52% by 2.42% for Measurement 5A of this Indicator.

Measurement B: During FFY 2015 one hundred and eighty-seven (187) out of one thousand seventy-five (1,075) or (17.40%) of children and youths with disabilities ages six (6) through twenty (21) were in separate schools, residential facilities or homebound/hospital placements. The VIDE/SOSE *met and exceeded the target for FFY 2015* of 20% by 2.60% for Measurement 5B of this Indicator.

Measurement C: During FFY 2015 thirty (38) out of one thousand seventy-five (1,075) or (3.53%) of children and youths with disabilities ages six (6) through twenty (21) were in separate schools, residential facilities or homebound/hospital placements. The VIDE/SOSE *did not meet the target for FFY 2015* of 3.05% by 0.48% for Measurement 5C of this Indicator.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data								92.50%	92.05%	95.71%	94.31%
B	2011	Target ≤									1.19%	5.00%	4.50%
		Data								1.24%	1.32%	0%	5.69%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%	94.50%
Target B ≤	5.50%	4.50%	4.25%	1.19%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

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

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Stakeholder input for the VIDE/SOSE's FFY 2015 State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) for all the indicators was provided by the Stakeholder Group at its January 2017 meeting. Stakeholders reviewed data for the past years, FFY 2013 and FFY 2014 and actual data for FFY 2015, and provided suggestions for targets for FFY 2015- 2018 and recommended the adjustment for this Indicator, particularly Measurement B to 5.5%, which was modified above. The VIDE/SOSE recognizes that Measurement B for this indicator has been adjusted by 1.5%, as stakeholders were able to look at trend data for separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. Thus acknowledges that the data supports the group setting. Moreover, upon careful review by VIDE/SOSE placements into this setting complied with the procedural safeguards for all children with disabilities who have and IEP.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	132	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	127	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	n	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

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

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	127	132	94.31%	93.50%	96.21%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4	132	5.69%	5.50%	3.03%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States Response to OSEP Comments

Revised May 1, 2017

The VIDE/SOSE revised its targets for this indicator to reflect improvement over the baseline data.

Measurement A: During FFY 2015 one hundred and twenty-seven (127) out of one hundred and thirty-two (132) or (96.21%) of children with IEPs ages three (3) through five (5) were in a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. The VIDE/SOSE **met and exceeded the target for FFY 2015** of 93.50% by 2.71% for Measurement 6A of this Indicator.

Measurement B: During FFY 2015 four (4) out of one hundred and thirty-two (132) or (3.03%) of children with IEPs ages three (3) through five (5) were in a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. The VIDE/SOSE **met and exceeded the target for FFY 2015** of 5.50% by 2.47% for Measurement 6B of this Indicator.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						44.90%	45.40%	46.40%	46.40%	65.00%	66.00%
		Data					9.90%	44.90%	79.30%	77.87%	77.78%	86.00%	82.76%
A2	2008	Target ≥						32.20%	32.70%	33.70%	33.70%	40.00%	40.00%
		Data					0%	32.20%	68.40%	37.97%	46.02%	79.27%	65.06%
B1	2008	Target ≥						46.43%	46.93%	47.93%	47.93%	67.50%	67.50%
		Data					14.10%	46.43%	77.10%	69.81%	67.07%	79.25%	75.00%
B2	2008	Target ≥						27.12%	27.62%	28.62%	28.62%	32.00%	32.00%
		Data					0%	27.12%	71.40%	39.24%	31.86%	80.49%	51.81%
C1	2008	Target ≥						57.14%	57.64%	58.64%	58.64%	70.00%	78.00%
		Data					11.30%	57.14%	91.50%	84.31%	77.63%	91.30%	89.29%
C2	2008	Target ≥						40.68%	41.18%	42.18%	42.18%	40.00%	40.00%
		Data						40.68%	87.80%	37.97%	38.05%	90.24%	66.27%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
Target A2 ≥	40.50%	41.00%	42.00%	42.00%
Target B1 ≥	68.00%	68.50%	68.50%	69.00%
Target B2 ≥	32.50%	33.00%	33.00%	33.50%
Target C1 ≥	78.50%	79.00%	79.00%	79.50%
Target C2 ≥	40.50%	40.50%	41.00%	42.00%

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 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	78.00
--	-------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	5.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	4.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	29.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	40.00	

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	29.00	38.00	82.76%	67.00%	76.32%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	40.00	78.00	65.06%	40.50%	51.28%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	3.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	11.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	29.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	35.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	29.00	43.00	75.00%	68.00%	67.44%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	35.00	78.00	51.81%	32.50%	44.87%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

Although the VIDE/SOSE did not meet its target by 0.56%, the actual performance data has shown slippage for FFY 2015 in Outcome B-Summary Statement 1 perhaps can be attributed with the need to heightened focus on sharing language development strategies that can be utilized in the home environment.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	5.00	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2.00	
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	32.00	
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	0.00	
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	39.00	

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	32.00	39.00	89.29%	78.50%	82.05%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	39.00	78.00	66.27%	40.50%	50.00%

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)

The VIDE/SOSE defines "comparable to same age peers" as the approximate capabilities of children of a given age, across a variety of settings and situations, by however those capabilities can be demonstrated. Functioning comparable to same age level peers is not to be determined by only a single score on a norm referenced test or any other single assessment. While such scores when used in conjunction with other sources of information could inform a decision on the child's status with regard to an outcome or how much progress a child has made. This definition was adopted from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
(ECO).

Listed below are the numerical values adopted from the Child Observation Records(COR) web-based scoring system. Data are extracted from this system for each child and each of the domains, and then disaggregated for each of the progress areas.

1. Emerging is: <1.50
2. Somewhat proficient is: 1.50-2.50
3. Proficient is: 2.50-3.50
4. Somewhat Mastered is: 3.50-4.50
5. Mastered is: 4.50-5.00

The VIDE/SOSE obtains the Child Observation Records (COR) raw scores for each preschool child with Individualized Education Program (IEP) from the Department of Human Services, Head Start Programs throughout the Territory and aggregates the collected data.

Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE obtains the LAP-3 results for those children receiving special education and related services in environments other than the Head Start Programs from each district and the online Redeset Grow online data system. Each Local Educational Agency (LEA) is responsible for assessing children who receive special education and related services in environments other than Head Start. The LAP-3 is administered by district preschool teachers, who capture *entry* and *exit* data for each child.

The LAP-3 was chosen for use in the Virgin Islands as it was found to be a reliable and valid tool for evaluating the development of young children, based on a 2003 study that was conducted to examine its reliability and validity. The Virgin Islands Department of Education has utilized the LAP-3 to compare with the COR since 2009. The areas extracted for the domain areas to obtain data that can be reliably and validly compared with the COR are listed in the chart below and are based on the rules of the LAP-3 for establishing basal scores.

The chart below shows the various skills in each of the six domains that are assessed using the COR.

COR ASSESSMENT DOMAINS

I. Initiative

- A. Making Choices
- B. Solving problems with materials
- C. Initiating Play

- D. Taking care of personal needs

II. Social Relations

- E. Relating to adults
- F. Relating to other children
- G. Resolving interpersonal conflict
- H. Understanding and expressing feelings

III. Creative Representation

- I. Making and building models
- J. Drawing and painting pictures
- K. Pretending

IV. Music and Movement

- L. Moving in various ways
- M. Moving with objects
- N. Feeling and expressing steady beat
- O. Moving to music

V. Language

- Q. Listening
- R. Using Vocabulary
- S. Using complex patterns of speech

- T. Showing awareness of sounds in words

- U. Demonstrating Knowledge about books

- V. Using letter names and sounds

- W. Reading

- X. Writing

VI. Mathematics and Science

- Y. Sorting Objects

- Z. Identifying patterns

- AA. Comparing properties

- BB. Counting

- CC. Identifying position and direction

- DD. Identifying materials and properties

- EE. Identifying natural and living things

The VIDE utilizes the following sub-elements from the COR assessment to obtain progress in each of the three domains reported on for this indicator.

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

Indicator 7 Measurement	COR Assessment Domain
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> II. Social Relations E. Relating to adults F. Relating to other children G. Resolving interpersonal conflict H. Understanding and expressing feelings
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> V. Language and Literacy Q. Listening and understanding speech R. Using vocabulary S. Using complex patterns of speech T. Showing awareness of sounds in words U. Demonstrating knowledge about books V. Using name and sounds W. Reading X. Writing
C. Use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Initiative A. Making choices B. Solving problems with materials C. Initiating play D. Taking care of personal needs

Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP)

Reporting Domains	LAP-3 Domains	Basal/Ceiling Score
1. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	Personal/Social	45
1. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language communication and early literacy)	Language	69
1. Use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Self Help	50

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.25%	82.50%
Data			76.00%	83.50%	83.50%	1.20%	83.70%	80.71%	83.02%	81.51%	83.49%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	83.00%	83.00%	83.50%	83.50%

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 parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
581.00	680.00	83.49%	83.00%	85.44%

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

Each parent/guardian of a preschool child with disability ages three (3) through five (5) is called and encouraged to respond to the survey. The survey instrument utilized by the University of the Virgin Islands (UVI) Eastern Caribbean Center(ECC) is inclusive of questions for preschool children ages three (3) through five (5) and questions for school aged children ages six (6) through twenty-one (21).

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

Background

The University of the Virgin Islands (UVI), Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC) has conducted the VIDE/BOSE's parental satisfaction survey since the initiation of the State Performance Plan (SPP). The VIDE entered into its eight (8th) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the ECC to conduct the FFY 2015 (2015-2016 school year) parent satisfaction survey, to gauge the percent of parents with a child receiving special education and related services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Composition

Each parent of each preschool child, ages three (3) through five (5) and school aged children ages six (6) through twenty-one (21), is contacted via telephone and encouraged to participate by responding to the survey. Although ECC contacts every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and families who refuse to respond to the survey; cannot be reached by telephone; moved; failed to update telephone numbers; do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey. For FFY 2015, as in the past, the parents who responded to the survey are representative of the racial, ethnic and socioeconomic groups that make up the United States Virgin Islands.

Process

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

The entire survey process is carried out by the Director of the ECC who is responsible for hiring, training and supervising temporary employees to conduct the telephonic interviews of all parents/guardians of children with disabilities ages three (3) through twenty-one (21). Each temporary employee of the ECC must take a confidentiality oath, orally and in writing, after being informed about the seriousness of the consequences for violating this oath. Consequences for violating the oath of confidentiality include: dismissal, referral and/or prosecution by the Virgin Islands Department of Justice. The temporary employees ("survey takers") are provided with the necessary training to include extensive background information on the reasons for the parental satisfaction survey.

Moreover, the Director of the ECC and other involved personnel also provide training on the stringent protocols that they have been instituted to ensure that all surveys are conducted in a uniform manner to yield valid and reliable results. Additionally, personnel from the VIDE/SOSE attends the interview training session to provide the interviewers with background knowledge on the reason for the collection of the parental satisfaction survey data. In essence, the VIDE/SOSE utilizes the training session as an opportunity to answer any questions that may be posed by the interviewers. The VIDE/SOSE provides an electronic list with contact information for all parents/guardian for children with disabilities throughout the Territory, which is extracted from the State Student Management System (GoalView). Utilizing the protocols that ECC establishes, attempts are made to call all parents. VIDE/SOSE also supplements parental contact information with the assistance of the Division of Planning, Research & Evaluation, for those parents and guardian who ECC returned to SOSE and noted as having an invalid telephone number. The latter enables the VIDE/SOSE to secure the best possible response rate (*all parents/guardians*).

The survey is conducted using strict standards that require the survey interviewers to make calls at various times of the day, including calls during daytime hours, evening hours, weekends and holidays. Each survey taker has a script, which is practiced a number of times during training, with each person at the training taking turns both conducting and responding to the survey, while personnel from the VIDE/SOSE observe the process. This step is completed to ensure that all survey takers are reading the script accurately and fluently. In addition, there are a prescribed number of attempts that must be made before the parent or guardian is considered a "non-responder." No less than ten (10) attempts must be made on various days and at various times, before survey interviewer may consider a parent or guardian a "non-responder." Telephone calls are made in this way to maximize the chances of parent participation by attempting to reach parents and guardians at either their residences or places of business (telephone number listed).

In order to gauge the level of parental satisfaction from the respondent parents the ECC utilizes Likert type questions (e. Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree). Once the data telephonic survey phase is completed each questionnaire is scanned and digitally entered into a database. Subsequent to the digitalization of the surveys, the results of the survey are tabulated to reveal frequencies and percentages. Moreover, ECC analyzes the raw scores by employing a rigorous methodology with the field of the Item Response Theory (IRT). This method converts ordinal level measures to interval level measures for which mathematics operations can be completed. The examination of the ordinal scores. ECC utilizes the Rasch's Rating Scale Model (RSM) to produce linear levels. Upon compilation of the data analysis and compilation ECC prepares the results in a draft report, which is later submitted to VIDE/SOSE for review.

Upon completion of the review, ECC compiles the final report and collaborate with SOSE to confirm a date for the public presentation of the survey results, which is hosted and presented by the director of ECC and other ECC personnel in each one of the Local Education Agencies (LEAs). To ensure public awareness of the event SOSE prepares the territorial media notices for dissemination. Parents/guardians, stakeholder groups and members of the Virgin Islands Advisory Panel on Special Education (VIAPSE) are encourage to attend.

During the public presentation University of the Virgin Islands Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC) personnel presents the in-depth results of the survey, while making comparison to previous years through the utilization of trend data. During the time of the presentation attendees are encouraged to ask questions. Inquiries from the attendees are addressed either by the VIDE/SOSE or personnel from the University of the Virgin Islands Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC). This segment of the public presentation allows opportunities for attendees to build, collaborate and strengthen relationships with other families, groups in attendance, and most importantly, the personnel from UVI, ECC as it relates to post-secondary opportunities for youths with disabilities(YWD).

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)

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

The VIDE/SOSE receives its data for this Indicator yearly from the University of the Virgin Islands (UVI), Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC), the contractor of services. The VIDE/SOSE received this data and has updated its FFY 2015 data for this Indicator.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2	0	2	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

The VIDE/SOSE defines disproportionate representation using a relative difference in composition calculation, comparing children with disabilities in racial/ethnic groups to the population of children without disabilities in that same district. The VIDE/SOSE uses a minimum “n” of 10.

Disproportionate representation is present in any district where the relative difference in composition for children with disabilities in any race or ethnic group in comparison to the total population of all students in that same district is 20% or over. As such, if there is a relative difference of 20% or more between the percent of children receiving special education and related services in any racial or ethnic group in a district that meets the minimum “n” size of 10 in comparison to the “comparison group” (e.g., nondisabled student population in that same district), then the district is flagged as having disproportionate representation.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2015:

During FFY 2015, two (2) out of two (2) districts (100%) were identified as having disproportionate representation in the racial/ethnic group. In the St. Croix district, *Two or More Race* students with disabilities were identified as having disproportionate representation when compared with all nondisabled students enrolled in the district. In the St. Thomas/St. John district, *White students* with disabilities were identified as having disproportionate representation when compared with nondisabled students in the district. No districts were excluded from the calculation based on a minimum of “n” of 10.

To determine whether the disproportionate representation, based on a relative difference in composition, is the result of inappropriate identification, the VIDE/SOSE had each district complete a Facilitated Self-Analysis Guide. The VIDE/SOSE then reviewed the districts' responses to determine whether the disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification. The self-analysis guide contains questions that address the following areas: *Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referral for Evaluation; Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards.*

Using the criteria established above, the VIDE/SOSE identified both districts' as having disproportionate representation, however, in order to determine whether the disproportionate representation in racial and ethnic categories was the results of policies, practices and procedures, the VIDE/SOSE had both Districts' complete the Facilitated Self Analysis Assessment for Disproportionate Representation to determine if the threshold was due to the lack of implementation of policies, practices and procedures. The districts' responses on the *Facilitated Self Analysis Assessment for Disproportionate Representation* showed IDEA compliant policies, practices and procedures in each of the areas addressed. The VIDE/SOSE concurred with the districts' analyses and concluded that the identified disproportionate representation is not a result of inappropriate identification in racial ethnic categories.

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

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2	0	2	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

The VIDE/SOSE defines disproportionate representation as a relative difference in composition of +/- 20%. A district is considered to have disproportionate representation if the relative difference in composition for children in a specific disability category, (i.e., *Intellectual Disabilities, Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Disturbance, Speech or Language Impairments, Other Health Impairments, and Autism*) for one or more racial and ethnic groups, is +/- 20% or more than the overall student population for that same racial and ethnic group. For instance, if there is a relative difference of 20% or more between the percentage of children receiving special education and related services in any one of the six (6) noted disability categories who are from any racial and ethnic group when compared with nondisabled student population in that same district, then the district is considered to have disproportionate representation. The VIDE/SOSE utilizes a minimum "n" of 10 students, meaning that there must be at least 10 students with disabilities in any racial and ethnic group and at least 10 students in the specific disability category in the district in order for the relative difference in composition to be calculated.

Using the methodology above, the St. Croix district had at least the minimum "n" of 10 for African American/Black students in each of the six disability categories, and at least the minimum "n" of 10 for Two or More Races in one (1) of the disability categories, and at least the minimum "n" of 10 for Hispanic/Latino students in four (4) of the six disability categories. The St. Thomas/St. John district had at least the minimum "n" of 10 for African American/Black students in five (5) of the six disability categories and at least the minimum "n" of 10 for Hispanic/Latino students in at least one (1) of the six disability categories. Hence, no districts were excluded as a result of using a minimum "n" of 10.

Using the criteria established above, the VIDE/SOSE identified both districts' as having disproportionate representation however, in order to determine whether the disproportionate representation in specific disabilities categories was the results of policies, practices and procedures, the VIDE/SOSE had both Districts' complete the Facilitated Self Analysis Assessment for Disproportionate Representation to determine if the threshold was due to the lack of implementation of policies, practices and procedures. The districts' responses on the *Facilitated Self Analysis Assessment for Disproportionate Representation* showed IDEA compliant policies, practices and procedures in each of the areas addressed. The VIDE/SOSE concurred with the districts' analyses and concluded that the identified disproportionate representation is not a result of inappropriate identification in specific disability categories.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		1.20%	21.00%	35.00%	97.00%	99.23%	100%	100%	99.10%	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

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
205	205	100%	100%	100%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	0
---	---

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

DATA SOURCE:

The VIDE/SOSE developed a worksheet that was provided to and used by the districts in reporting monthly timelines for initial evaluations for students with disabilities (i.e., Data Report 1.A-1:Initial Evaluation). This worksheet, in conjunction with data reported through the State Student Management System ("Goalview"), is used by the state to ensure that both the Data Report and Goalview had the same dates of consent and dates of last evaluation for Indicator 11. The VIDE/SOSE also developed a self-calculating spreadsheet that tracks the timeline between parental consent and initial evaluation for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016.

Additionally, the state conducts desk audits and on-site verification visits/monitoring activities to each Local Education Agency (LEA). The purpose of the verification/on-site monitoring is to determine if data regarding evaluations are accurate, valid and reliable. The results of these activities confirmed that data provided by the LEAs were accurate.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

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

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		60.00%	81.40%	100%	97.00%	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

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	51
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	16
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	33
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	2
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	33	33	100%	100%	100%

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

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data Sources:

The State collects data from the districts on all children referred from Part C for eligibility determination under Part B, and compare these data to data provided by Part C programs of all children referred by the Part C programs prior to age 3, who were referred for eligibility determination. These data are entered into an internal database which was developed to capture all the data elements for children referred from Part C programs to Part B programs for eligibility determination.

These data elements are as follows: *Child's Name, Child's Date of Birth, Date of Transition Meeting, Date Child was determined Eligible/Not Eligible, Date of Development of Individualized Education Program (IEP) and Date When Services Began or Refused by Parent.*

The data source for this indicator is both the State Monitoring system, state student management system ("GoalView") and State data base which includes data for the entire reporting year, July 1 2015 through June 30, 2016 (for children who were born between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013).

Additionally, the State conducts desk audits, on-site verification visits to each Local Education Agency (LEA) and on-site monitoring activities to validate the data submitted to the state by each district on its Part C to B Transition Report which is submitted to the VIDE/SOSE each month.

Of the two (2) children in (d) one (1) of the two (2) parents elected to have services begin one week after the child's third (3rd) birthday due to off-island travel, and the remaining one (1) child's parent requested to reschedule meeting. These two (2) children parents did have initial services provided by Part B less than 8/3/2017

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

one week after their third birthday

All children included in "a" are in b, c, d, or e. There were an additional three (3) children who were provided services in Part C and referred to Part B prior to their 3rd birthdays for eligibility determination. However, after these children were referred, two (2) of those three (3) children parents refused Part B services and the remaining one (1) child's family moved out of the Territory.

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

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		19.70%	45.97%	96.10%		100%	97.70%	37.28%	62.26%	88.72%	92.73%

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 youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
377	377	92.73%	100%	100%

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data Source for this Indicator are comprised of both the State Monitoring System and state student management system("GoalView").

In September 2016, the VIDE/SOSE collected data from GoalView to create an internal spreadsheet consisting of all students with IEPs who are age 16 and over from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. The VIDE/SOSE then reviewed through desk audit, the IEPs of each students listed on the spreadsheet using the National Technical Assistance Center (NTACT) Indicator 13 checklist for compliance with the regulatory transition requirements. If the required information was not contained in the IEP portion of GoalView, the VIDE/SOSE reviewed additional documents in the student's GoalView file to determine if the record contained evidence of compliance with the transition requirements. If any of the required evidence could not be found in the student's file or in GoalView, the item on the checklist was marked ("no") for not compliant.

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	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--

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

	Corrected Within One Year	Corrected	
24	24	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The VIDE/SOSE reported 24 findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2014. Following the issuance of the letter of findings for this indicator, VIDE/SOSE provided targeted and on-going technical assistance to the LEA where the noncompliance were identified to support them in meeting the regulatory requirements relating to secondary transition. The VIDE/SOSE verified that the district where the noncompliance were identified was compliant with the specific regulatory requirements relating to secondary transition by ensuring that all IEPs were 100% compliant with the transition requirements for Indicator 13. Based on the review of data, 100% of the files in the LEA were found to be compliant. The correction of all noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 provided the evidence needed to ensure that the district was implementing the specific regulatory requirements as required for Prong 1 of OSEP Memo 09-02.

The VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis of all noncompliance for FFY 2014 and provided technical assistance on the reviews of the item analysis to the LEA district where the noncompliance was identified. The VIDE/SOSE then reviewed updated data (prong 2) using the NTACT transition checklist to determine if the LEA was meeting the regulatory requirements relating to secondary transition as reported in Indicator 13. Based on this review of updated data, 100% of the files were found to be compliant in the LEA where the noncompliance was identified. This updated compliance data provided the evidence needed that the district was implementing the specific regulatory requirements as required by Prong 2 of OSEP Memo 09-02.

The VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with both districts to implement the specific regulatory requirements as required for this indicator.

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

The VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis of all 24 noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and provided targeted technical assistance to the LEA where the noncompliant was identified. Following the issuance of the item analysis and technical assistance, VIDE/SOSE reviewed all 24 findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2014 to determine if all individual instance of noncompliance were meeting the specific regulatory requirements to satisfy Prong 1 of OSEP Memo 09-02 (Individual Correction). Based on the review of each of the students IEPs, all instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected this demonstrated correction of Prong 1 as required by OSEP Memo 09-02.

In order to verify that the district was meeting the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 13, A subsequent review of files (updated data) was conducted to determine if the LEA had demonstrated correction of systemic noncompliance. The VIDE/SOSE reviewed files of updated data (files of students since July 1, 2015 and whose files had not previously been examined) to determine if the LEA was meeting the regulatory requirements as reported in Indicator 13. Based on the review of each of the students IEPs, all instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected and updated data (prong 2) demonstrated correction of Prong 2 as required by OSEP Memo 09-02.

The VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with both districts to implement the specific regulatory requirements as required for this indicator.

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The VIDE/SOSE reported 30 findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2013. Following the issuance of the letter of findings for this indicator, VIDE/SOSE provided targeted and on-going technical assistance to the LEA where the noncompliance were identified to support them in meeting the regulatory requirements relating to secondary transition. The VIDE/SOSE verified that the district where the noncompliance were identified, was compliant with the specific regulatory requirements relating to secondary transition by ensuring that all IEPs were 100% compliant with the transition requirements for Indicator 13. Based on the review of data, 100% of the files in the LEA were found to be compliant. The correction of all noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 provided the evidence needed to ensure that the district was implementing the specific regulatory requirements as required for Prong 1 of OSEP Memo 09-02.

The VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis of all noncompliance for FFY 2013 and provided technical assistance on the reviews of the item analysis to the LEA district where the noncompliance was identified. The VIDE/SOSE then reviewed updated data (prong 2) using the NTACT transition checklist to determine if the LEA was meeting the regulatory requirements relating to secondary transition as reported in Indicator 13. Based on this review of updated data, 100% of the files were found to be compliant in the LEA where the noncompliant was identified. This updated compliance data provided the evidence needed that the district was implementing the specific regulatory requirements as required by Prong 2 of OSEP Memo 09-02.

The VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with both districts to implement the specific regulatory requirements as required for this indicator.

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

The VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis of all 30 noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and provided targeted technical assistance to the LEA where the noncompliant was identified. Following the issuance of the item analysis and technical assistance, VIDE/SOSE reviewed all 30 findings of noncompliance for Indicator 13 in FFY 2014 to determine if all individual instance of noncompliance were meeting the specific regulatory requirements to satisfy Prong 1 of OSEP Memo 09-02 (Individual Correction). Based on the review of each of the students' IEPs, all instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected which demonstrated correction of Prong 1 as required by OSEP Memo 09-02.

In order to verify that the district was meeting the regulatory requirements related to Indicator 13, a subsequent review of files (updated data) was conducted to determine if the LEA had demonstrated correction of systemic noncompliance. The VIDE/SOSE reviewed files of updated data (files of students since July 1, 2015 and whose files had not previously been examined) to determine if the LEA was meeting the regulatory requirements as reported in Indicator 13. Based on the review of each of the students' IEPs, all instances of previously identified noncompliance were corrected and updated data demonstrated correction of Prong 2 as required by OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

The VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with both districts to implement the specific regulatory requirements as required for this indicator.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							19.00%	20.00%	22.00%	22.50%	23.00%
		Data						19.00%	13.80%	6.59%	22.05%	9.71%	22.89%
B	2009	Target ≥							59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.50%
		Data						59.00%	37.50%	50.55%	50.39%	54.37%	46.99%
C	2009	Target ≥							80.00%	80.00%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%
		Data						80.00%	36.10%	71.43%	73.23%	77.67%	87.95%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	23.50%	24.00%	24.00%	25.00%
Target B ≥	60.50%	60.50%	61.00%	62.00%
Target C ≥	81.00%	81.50%	81.50%	82.00%

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 respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	77.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	20.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	33.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	11.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	0.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	20.00	77.00	22.89%	23.50%	25.97%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	53.00	77.00	46.99%	60.50%	68.83%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	64.00	77.00	87.95%	81.00%	83.12%

Was sampling used? No

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017

The VIDE/SOSE was able to collect responses from surveys for seventy-seven (77) leavers. The VIDE/SOSE was not able to contact all students because of outdated demographic information such as, invalid phone numbers, disconnected telephones, and or families whose contact information were not updated due to moved out of the territory. The students and families who were surveyed and responded (77 out of 138) are representative of the population of the United States Virgin Islands.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥					100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	80.00%	85.00%
Data					100%	100%	100%	80.00%	100%	100%	100%

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Explanation of Changes

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 B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	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
1	1	100%		100%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

.

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. For FFY 2015, the VIDE/SOSE had less than ten resolution sessions held, as such, the VIDE/SOSE is not required to establish baseline or targets until the fiscal year in which the number of resolutions sessions held is ten or more; at that time the VIDE/SOSE will report baseline and targets in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

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

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%			85.00%	90.00%
Data		81.20%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	50.00%	100%		

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

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Explanation of Changes

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

States Response to OSEP Comments for FFY 2015

Revised May 1, 2017(Clarification)

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. For FFY 2015, the VIDE/SOSE had less than ten mediations held, as such, the VIDE/SOSE is not required to establish baseline or targets until the fiscal year in which the number of mediations held is ten or more ; at that time the VIDE/SOSE will report baseline and targets in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP 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.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥		53.30%	54.30%
Data	53.30%		

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	54.30%	55.30%	55.30%

Key:

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 Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

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

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

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

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

Theory of Action

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

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

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

Please see attachment.

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

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

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 attachment.

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 attachment.

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 attachment.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

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

Please see attachment.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

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

Please see attachment.

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

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

Please see attachment.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

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

Please see attachment.

F. Plans for Next Year

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

Please see attachment.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Renee Charleswell, Ph.D.

Title: State Director of Special Education

Email: renee.charleswell@vide.vi

Phone: 340-776-5802