

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

US Virgin Islands



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE), like all other State Educational Agencies ("SEAs"), is required to establish and maintain an effective system of general supervision in accordance with 34 CFR §300.600. As such, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) State Office of Special Education (SOSE) has developed eight components in its general supervision system which is discussed in the preceding section of this document. The State Office of Special Education ("SOSE") as the SEA, is required, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.600 (a) – (d), to monitor and report on each Local Educational Agency's ("LEA") implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEIA) [20 USC § 1416(a)]. In addition, the VIDE/SOSE's Continuous Improvement Results-Focused Monitoring System (CIRFMS) is designed to promote improved educational outcomes for students with disabilities while ensuring the State meets the procedural and compliance requirements of the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEIA).

As a result of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Virgin Islands Department of Health guidelines relating to the COVID-19 National Emergency, during FFY 2019, (school year 2019-20) the VIDE shifted from an in-person instruction to a virtual instructional model for all students including students with disabilities. As a result of this, the Virgin Islands Department of Health guidelines relating to the COVID-19 National Emergency, for FFY 2019, (school year 2019-20) Spring 2020 (SY2019-20) Summative Assessments, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; pursuant to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, no Statewide Assessments were administered.

As noted in the VIDE/SOSE's State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report SPP/APR submitted February 2019, (FFY 2017) the Territory experienced two Category Five Hurricanes (Irma and Maria), which significantly impacted the infrastructure of the Territory. Although the Territory has commenced with the rebuilding of the infrastructure, the impact of these Hurricanes coupled with the National Pandemic has significantly impacted the scheduling and carrying-out of technical assistance (TA) and professional development (PD) activities for the 2018-19 and 2019/20 school years. Although the VIDE/SOSE did not experience any significant data collection issues as a result of COVID-19 for FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE anticipates there may be some for FFY 2020; if this is the case, those concerns will be discussed in the respective indicators. While the VIDE/SOSE made some progress during the 2018-19 school year relative to the scheduling and carrying-out of professional development activities, the VIDE/SOSE is cognizant that it must devise an intensive plan to make progress and achieve high levels of evidence-based professional development activities for the current and upcoming school years. This plan will require that the VIDE/SOSE continue to collaborate and intensify its collaborative efforts with the District leadership team in both districts on devising an integrated, robust PD activity calendar in which activities support the learning of all students. Nevertheless, the VIDE/SOSE continues to evaluate the progress relative to the level of recovery and the necessary next steps relative to supporting TA and PD geared towards improving functional and educational outcomes for children and youth with disabilities and remains steadfast in its commitment to ensuring that the lives of the students and their families are enhanced. Thus, the VIDE/SOSE's goal is to create a paramount environment where growth is achieved by all administrators, educators, support personnel, and all students, more specifically children and youth with disabilities. This will be accomplished through continued engagement and increased involvement of all internal and external stakeholders. Furthermore, the promotion of great educational opportunities will always be at the forefront of the VIDE/SOSE as we strive to improve functional and academic outcomes for children and youth with disabilities and continue the ongoing implementation of the VIDE/SOSE's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Thus, the VIDE/SOSE maintains active engagement and collaboration with internal and external stakeholders in developing, reviewing, and evaluating implementation data. Internal stakeholders include VIDE Leadership and other State Program Directors who are engaged in the development of the VIDE's Strategic Plan and other VIDE consultants from Curriculum and Instruction, English as a Second Language (ESL), and Information Technology (IT). External stakeholders include parents of children with disabilities, teachers, school administrators, district administrators of special education, and district curriculum coordinators. Meetings, including those with external and internal stakeholders, have been held to address all Phases of the SSIP and more importantly, yearly performance data to gauge/evaluate the implementation of the SSIP. Furthermore, the VIDE/SOSE also welcomes input from stakeholders on an informal basis.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The VIDE/SOSE has developed a comprehensive data system that enables the Territory to collect, analyze, and report timely, valid, and reliable Section 616 and Section 618 data as required by the IDEIA. The State has employed a Part B Data Manager who coordinates all data collection, analysis, and reporting requirements within special education. The Part B Data Manager works closely with personnel from the Office of Planning, Research Development (PRE), the VIDE division responsible for collecting, housing, and reporting all data based on numerous Federal and Territorial regulations. Additionally, the Data Manager provides ongoing technical assistance to each LEA to ensure they meet all reporting requirements, provide the necessary data clarifications and update on revisions/changes to reporting requirements of all 618 and 619 data.

In 2001, the VIDE/SOSE purchased a comprehensive online web-based special education student data management system ("GoalView") which serves as the online Individualized Education Program (IEP) system for the LEAs and provides a primary method of collecting Section 616 and Section 618 data for the VIDE/SOSE. The Part B Data Manager has worked and continues to work diligently with the developers/vendors of this application to customize it to meet the collection and reporting for the Virgin Islands Department of Education. All revisions and upgrades to the system are followed by intensive training and technical assistance regarding the use of GoalView. Trainings are provided to SOSE and LEA personnel. This web-based system ("GoalView") has numerous business rules with corresponding built-in edit checks which promote high levels of data quality. Additionally, GoalView provides data for required public reporting and is also used as a primary data source for all monitoring activities. Each year as necessary, the VIDE/SOSE personnel conducts on-site monitoring visits in each of the LEAs to verify that data in GoalView is consistent with the information contained in the students' IEPs and other associated records. More importantly, updates are implemented in accordance with the regulation and in consultation with the LEAs.

Furthermore, in some instances, additional data are obtained from the Office of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) the data division that houses all data related to the VIDE's Student Information System (SIS) "PowerSchool". This comprehensive SIS serves as the primary collection tool for a variety of data collections including, but not limited to, enrollment data, assessment data, attendance data, co-teaching assignments, and discipline occurrences, and the accompanying incidences. The Virgin Islands Department of Education, State Office of Special Education, Part B Data Manager

works closely with personnel from the PRE to access data needed for 618 special education reporting such as assessment data, enrollment data, discipline reporting, and any additional school-level demographic data.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

2

General Supervision System

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

State Performance Plan(SPP)/Annual Performance Report(APR): 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 describes how the Territory will improve implementation of the IDEA over time, and 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 (SWD). For each indicator, the VIDE/SOSE provides baseline data, targets, and the corresponding timelines established by the state.

Each year, the VIDE/SOSE reports its performance on the seventeen (17) targets identified in the SPP/APR. Together, the SPP and APR provide a robust foundation and a blueprint for the work of the VIDE/SOSE implementation and purposes of IDEA. In FFY 2013, the SPP and APR were merged into one document and were submitted online annually in the specially designed platform, GRADS360 until recently. The submission process will continue in an online mode; however, beginning in February 2020, (FFY 2018), the newly designed module within the current EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) platform has been utilized for compiling and submitting all SPP/APR indicators. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned clusters of indicators and are individually responsible for collecting, and analyzing data, crafting/drafting responses, working collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress in meeting targets with internal and external stakeholders, the Virgin Islands Panel on Special Education (VIAPSE), thus evaluating the implementation of each indicator. The VIAPSE is the primary Stakeholder group for the SPP/APR in the Territory. Advisory Panel members review indicator data, specifically trend data, and assist the VIDE/SOSE in establishing or revising as necessary targets for each indicator. Furthermore, External and CORE internal stakeholders have and continue to play a pivotal role in the development of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), which was a new indicator in FFY 2013 and was developed in phases with accompanying implementation years. In April 2020, the FFY 2018 reporting of Phase IV, Year 5 of the SSIP was reported in Indicator seventeen (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)]. The VISER Rules apply to the VIDE, the two LEAs within the Territory, and those public agencies with educational programs and schools.

Most importantly, 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 examines LEAs on the implementation of the requirements outlined 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 facilitated the development of the Territorial Special Education Procedures to support the two LEAs in uniformly implementing the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, as amended in 2004 (IDEA 2004), and the Virgin Islands Department of Education's Special Education Rules, as Amended in 2009 (VISER). This territorial procedural manual was developed to eliminate the likelihood of each district developing procedures individually. Teachers and administrators within each of the LEAs have been and continue to receive technical assistance on the procedures contained within this procedural manual.

Integrated Monitoring:

A key component of the VIDE/SOSE's general supervision system is its integrated monitoring activities. Similar to other states and territories, the VIDE's monitoring systems have historically focused on procedural compliance with the (IDEIA) program requirements. However, with a shift in focus on results-driven outcomes for all students, the VIDE/SOSE, in collaboration with its CORE internal stakeholders and other VIDE divisions, has instituted several initiatives, specifically, research-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 transforms from a model of procedural monitoring to one of continuous improvement with a focus on improving student academic and functional outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

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/SOSE 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, the fidelity of compliant practices is supported using a tiered monitoring approach that enables the VIDE/SOSE 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 and targeted professional development.

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 levels and needs which are based on each LEA district's performance relative to APR state targets 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 any area of non-compliance 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 VIDE's/SOSE's monitoring manual.

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.

General, targeted, and intensive technical assistance activities are primarily driven by data collected and the needs of the LEAs. Moreover, 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 educational outcomes for all children/youth with disabilities. Technical assistance information is shared through the following mediums; email, conference calls, and face-to-face meetings (before the onset of COVID-19). Additional information about the VIDE/SOSE system of technical assistance is included in the separate item for technical assistance.

In order to continue to provide technical assistance to LEA, the VIDE/SOSE continue to consult with TA providers from a variety of federally-funded technical assistance centers such as the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTAC), the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) formerly the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center, Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), 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 on-going access to these national experts and additional resources provided has been very helpful to the VIDE/SOSE. The VIDE/SOSE continues its membership in the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Language and Literacy Cross-State Learning Collaborative. Membership in this collaborative enables the VIDE/SOSE to continue implementation of educational strategies, specifically reading, evaluation of selected strategies, and most importantly sustainability that will aid in improving educational outcomes for all children/youth with disabilities.

The 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 all children/youth with disabilities. Professional development is provided by VIDE/SOSE, technical assistance providers from OSEP-funded centers, and private consultants. Although for the FFY 2018, the VIDE did reestablish the customary full school day the VIDE/SOSE continued to encounter further challenges (see executive summary) challenges relative to the quantity of completed professional learning opportunities for FFY 2019 (SY2019/2020).

VIDE/SOSE provides technical assistance to the identified LEA to assist them in developing a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), and with implementing the activities needed to correct the noncompliance. The report includes timelines for correction of noncompliance. Furthermore, 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 respective LEA once correction of the noncompliance has been verified, consistent with both prongs of Memo 09-02, as cited above.

In addition to the CAP, 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. Also, for FFY 2018, the VIDE/SOSE funded some on-site quality professional development opportunities because many educators and administrators had difficulty accessing professional development opportunities on the U.S. mainland. The number of on-site PD opportunities were somewhat limited which was due to scheduling conflicts with other district-based PD. Some of the topics addressed during these sessions included job-embedded researched-based instructional strategies to aid with improving instruction in the general education core curriculum and supporting compliant practices relative to secondary transition.

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. Until March 2020, most professional learning activities occurred as face-to-face professional development sessions. Due to the ongoing presence of the COVID-19, the VIDE/SOSE was unable to provide on-site professional development sessions. During FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE was able to offer online courses to administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and other professionals. More importantly, the VIDE/SOSE continue to collaborate with the LEAs to investigate ways to improve online and virtual learning and teaching instructional strategies and accessibility for teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals to aid with increase student academic engagement and growth. Additionally, School Improvement Teams/Data Chat teams have been established at many schools and provide an avenue for sharing information (e.g. instructional strategies, data interpretation, effective classroom practices) with school personnel.

As in the past, a significant amount of professional development has focused on meeting the requirements related to secondary transition as reported in Indicator 13. To continue to maintain this trend, the VIDE/SOSE personnel obtained training from the National Technical Assistance Center (NTAC) and then customized this professional development for district personnel. VIDE/SOSE continues to work diligently to provide heightened professional development to teachers and other school-based personnel in each LEA related to this indicator. Consequently, the LEAs have been able to maintain compliance with Indicator 13 of the SPP/APR.

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 and continues to partner with personnel 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:

Stakeholder Involvement

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

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education

(TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

Public Reporting:

As required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A) the VIDE/SOSE's public reporting for FFYs FFY 2016, 2017, and 2018, of each LEAs performance can be accessed on the Virgin Islands Department of Education's homepage web portal www.vide.vi homepage first click on the "Our Divisions" tab, then click on Special Education. In addition to each LEA performance, public access is available for a complete copy of the State's SPP, which includes no revisions to the submitted FFY 2015 APR.

To access public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), complete the following : (a) visiting the Virgin Islands Department of Education's webpage at www.vide.vi (b) click on "Our Divisions" tab then (c) select Planning Research and Evaluation tab, (d) click on the Virgin Islands Report Card tab (e) Transitional Report Card (2014-15 to present Report Card), and under the menu of Transitional Report select Assessment Participation Rate or Assessment Proficiency Rate. Note, Reports may take a moment to generate, works best when allowed to generate the most recent Assessment school year (2018/19). Once the latter is completed select the desired area in the respective drop-down menu(s) (e.g. school year).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the VIDOE must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the VIDOE must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the VIDOE must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the VIDOE's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the VIDOE's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the Virgin Islands' FFY 2020 IDEA Part B grant award and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the determination.

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the Virgin Islands does not have any FFY 2019 data for Indicator 17.

Intro - Required Actions

OSEP notes that the Virgin Islands submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 17 attachments included in the Virgin Islands' FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the Virgin Islands must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	19.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	32.00%	35.00%	38.00%	41.00%	44.00%
Data	41.49%	48.39%	52.58%	53.21%	49.53%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	44.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	39

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	83
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	46.99%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
39	83	49.53%	44.50%	46.99%	Met Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

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 (Carnegie Unit) toward graduation with a high school diploma. Students are required to complete 100 hours of community service to graduate.

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

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE used the 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate to determine the graduation rate for students with disabilities. The calculation for determining the number of students with disabilities who graduated with a regular diploma is as follows:

Using the FFY 2019 (school year 2018-2019) data as required, 39 of 83 (46.99%) students with disabilities in the 4-Year ACGR graduated from high school with a regular diploma.

Numerator: # of students with disabilities in the 4-Year ACGR who earn a regular high school diploma through the summer of 2019 was 39.

During FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators by engaging in ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners thus building capacity and guiding its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

Denominator: # of first time 9th graders with disabilities who entered in the fall of (2015) + students who transfer in, minus, students who transfer out (die or emigrate) during school years 2015-2016 + 2016-2017 +2017-2018 +2018-2019 (including summer of 2019 were 83.

Calculation: 39 / 83 x 100= 46.99%

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

1 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2008	4.59%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	4.50%	4.25%	4.00%	3.75%	3.75%
Data	10.92%	4.98%	5.14%	7.64%	6.80%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	3.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	40
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	13
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	0
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	29
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	1

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

The VIDE/SOSE used the same calculation that was used for FFY 2018, as permitted, by OSEP Memorandum 14-2.

Denominator: # of students with IEPs who exited due to dropping out divided by the total # of youth with IEPs ages 14-21 enrolled in grades 7 through 12.

Calculation: $29 / 540 \times 100 = 5.37\%$

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
29	540	6.80%	3.75%	5.37%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

The VIDE/SOSE definition of dropout is a student who is enrolled at the beginning of the school year and who is not enrolled at the conclusion of that school year. The definition of dropout is the same for students without IEPs.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with the LEA to ensure the best possible outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE implementation of the State Results Driven Accountability Exiting Report that requires each LEA to report monthly to the SOSE the names of students, schools, progress reports, and reason for exiting school prior to the end of that school year. This data will be utilized to assist each LEA with ensuring that every child that exits school in any manner other than receiving a high school diploma or certificate of completion is afforded with a selection of post school options and or strategies best suited to graduate high school.

During FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators by engaging in

ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners thus building capacity and guiding its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

2 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	95.50%	95.50%	96.00%	96.00%	96.50%
A	Overall	92.70%	Actual	95.05%	100.00%	100.00%		94.62%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	95.50%	95.50%	96.00%	96.00%	96.50%
A	Overall	92.70%	Actual	94.65%	100.00%	100.00%		93.75%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			94.62%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			93.75%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

To access public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), complete the following : (a) visiting the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s webpage at www.vide.vi (b) click on "Our Divisions" tab then (c) select Panning Research and Evaluation tab,(d)click on the Virgin Islands Report Card tab (e) Transitional Report Card (2014-15 to present Report Card), and under the menu of Transitional Report select Assessment Participation Rate or Assessment Proficiency Rate. Note, Reports may take a moment to generate, works best when allowed to generate the most recent Assessment school year (2018/19). Once the latter is completed select the desired area in the respective drop-down menu(s) (e.g. school year).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As a result of the Centers for Disease Control Prevention and Virgin Islands Department of Health guidelines relating to the COVID-19 National Emergency, for FFY 2019, (school year 2019-20) Spring 2020 (SY2019-20) Summative Assessments, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; pursuant to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, no Statewide Assessments were administered.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

3B - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Virgin Islands did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%	54.50%
A	Overall	11.64%	Actual	8.68%	10.97%	92.10%		83.89%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2008	Target >=	52.90%	52.90%	52.90%	52.90%	52.90%
A	Overall	19.90%	Actual	7.77%	7.94%	92.54%		86.43%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	52.90%
Math	A >=	Overall	52.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education

(TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

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											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above											

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			83.89%	52.90%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			86.43%	52.90%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

To access public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), complete the following : (a) visiting the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s webpage at www.vide.vi (b) click on "Our Divisions" tab then (c) select Planning Research and Evaluation tab,(d)click on the Virgin Islands Report Card tab (e) Transitional Report Card (2014-15 to present Report Card), and under the menu of Transitional Report select Assessment Participation Rate or Assessment Proficiency Rate. Note, Reports may take a moment to generate, works best when allowed to generate the most recent Assessment school year (2018/19). Once the latter is completed select the desired area in the respective drop-down menu(s) (e.g. school year)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As a result of the Centers for Disease Control Prevention and Virgin Islands Department of Health guidelines relating to the COVID-19 National Emergency, for FFY 2019, (school year 2019-20)Spring 2020 (SY2019-20) Summative Assessments, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; pursuant to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, no Statewide Assessments were administered.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

3C - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the Virgin Islands did not report any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2010	50.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	50.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

NO

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	2	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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

Definition of Significant and Identification of Comparison 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 IEPs in each district (LEA) to the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children without IEPs in that same district. A significant discrepancy exists when the rate ratio is 2.0 or greater for any district. 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Data Sources

Data are obtained from the Department of Education, Division of Planning, Research & Evaluation on September 2018 and the December 1, 2018 618 Child Count Data for Children with Disabilities. The Districts report discipline data to the VIDE using the Territory's Student Information System, Power School. The Territory's Student Information System is managed by the VIDE Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation (PRE) and includes a variety of edit checks to ensure accuracy of submitted data. The State verifies the reliability and accuracy of the State's data through automated verification checks through its database.

Discipline data from this system are utilized to satisfy 618 data collection which is reported via EdFacts Reporting System by Disability Category (OSEP030) and captured on the Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the School Year 2018-2019. As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the State conducted a desk audit for FFY 2019 of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the School Year of 2018-2019.

Results

Based on discipline data from the school year 2018-2019, which is used in determining significant discrepancy for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR due February 2021, District One (St. Thomas/St. John) had four (4) students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled for greater than ten (10) days in the 2018-2019 school year. Of the 4 students suspended, the desk audit conducted revealed the following: (a) one (1) out of the four (4) students withdrew to attend Adult Education; and, (b) three (3) of the four students suspended during the 2018-2019 school year are currently enrolled for the 2020-2021 school year. The desk audit conducted also verified the implementation of a Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan and Manifestation Determination by the district for all of the four (4) students. Hence, the district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) and 34 CFR §300.530 and OSEP Memo 09-02 for this Indicator.

Additionally, in District Two (St. Croix), a total of ten (10) students with disabilities were subject to disciplinary removals for greater than ten (10) days in a school year. It is noted that all of the suspension days were cumulative days, out of school suspensions, for all of the ten students. The desk audit conducted revealed the following: (a) one of the ten students exited through graduation during the 2019-2020 school year; (b) two of the ten students exited the St. Croix School District through drop out, and are known to be working; (c) six (6) of the ten students suspended during the 2018-2019 school year are currently enrolled in school for the 2020-2021 school year; and (d) one of the ten students suspended during the 2018-2019 school year whereabouts is unknown, pursuant to the Student Tracking Form dated September 2020 and uploaded in Goalview. The desk audit conducted also verified the implementation of a Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan and Manifestation Determination by the district for eight (8) of the ten (10) students, whereas two of the ten students had an incomplete Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan uploaded in Goalview. There was evidence however of a Manifestation Determination hearing for those two students which documented that the infractions for which they were suspended was not a result of their disabling condition. Hence, the district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) and 34 CFR §300.530 and OSEP Memo 09-02 for this Indicator.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Review of policies

Based on the rate ratio methodology employed by the State to determine significant discrepancy, no district was found to have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions or expulsions of students with disabilities when compared to the overall suspensions/expulsion rates with non disabled students within that same district. Moreover, the State determined the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices comply with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR 300.170(b). During the desk audit conducted June 2020, using the Student Management System, ("Goalview"), there was evidence uploaded in Goalview for the specific student(s) who were suspended for greater than ten days in the school year 2018-2019. More specifically, and in conformity with the State's monitoring protocol checklist, there were documents relating to the implementation of IEPs, and the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards in each student specific files, as needed and required. Therefore, the State did not identify nor issue any findings of non-compliance for this indicator.

The State DID NOT 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 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

The VIDOE target for this Indicator for FFY 2019 is 50.00%

4A - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which 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 interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2010	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	2	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The VIDE/SOSE defines significant discrepancy by using a comparison methodology to determine whether significant discrepancy is occurring in the State by comparing the ratio of the district's suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities from any racial or ethnic group to the suspension/expulsion rate for all non-disabled children in that same LEA, consistent with the instructions for this indicator.

Methodology

A district is deemed to be significantly discrepant when (1) the 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 higher than the suspension rate for all children without IEPs in that same district; and (2) its policies, procedures or practices contributes 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.

Data Sources

The VIDE/SOSE uses the enrollment data from the Department of Education, Division of Planning Research & Evaluation (PRE) for School Year 2018-2019 (dated September 30, 2018) for the district comparison group and the 618 annual Child Count data collected on December 1, 2018 (SY 2018-2019) 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 2018-2019. In addition, discipline data for children without disabilities are captured as of September 30, 2018. The Districts report discipline data to the VIDE using the Territory's Student Information System, Power School. The Territory's Student Information System is managed by the VIDE Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation (PRE) and includes a variety of edit checks to ensure accuracy of submitted data. The State verifies the reliability and the accuracy of the State's data through automated verification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The desk audit conducted in June 2020 verified in District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) the implementation of a Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan and Manifestation Determination by the district for all of the four (4) students suspended during the 2018-2019 school year. Likewise, for District 2 (St. Croix), the desk audit also showed the implementation of a Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan and Manifestation Determination for eight (8) of the ten (10) students suspended during the 2018-2019 school year; (2) two (2) of the ten (10) students had an incomplete Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan uploaded in Goalview. However, there was evidence of a Manifestation Determination hearing for those two students which documented that the infractions for which they were suspended were not a result of their disabling condition. Moreover, the State determined that the LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices complied with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b). Therefore, the State did not identify nor issue any findings of non-compliance with Part B requirements for this indicator.

The State DID NOT 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 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	56.00%
A	58.44%	Data	55.25%	54.42%	56.44%	57.30%	57.60%
B	2019	Target <=	20.50%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
B	21.37%	Data	20.73%	17.40%	18.19%	19.61%	22.38%
C	2019	Target <=	3.05%	3.05%	3.05%	3.05%	2.95%
C	2.44%	Data	2.67%	3.53%	3.64%	3.98%	2.87%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	58.44%
Target B <=	21.37%
Target C <=	2.44%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	1,025
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	599
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	219
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	9
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	16
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	599	1,025	57.60%	58.44%	58.44%	Met Target	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	219	1,025	22.38%	21.37%	21.37%	Met Target	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	25	1,025	2.87%	2.44%	2.44%	Met Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 5

Measurement A: During FFY 2019, (December 1, 2019, Child Count) five hundred and ninety-nine (599) or (58.44%) out of one thousand and twenty-five (1025) of children with IEPs aged six (6) through twenty-one (21) were in the regular class for more than 80% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded the target of 56% by 2.44% for FFY 2019, for Measurement 5A of this Indicator.

Measurement B: During FFY 2019, (December 1, 2019, Child Count) two hundred and nineteen (219) or (21.37%) out of one thousand and twenty-five (1025) of children with IEPs aged six (6) through twenty-one (21) were in the regular class less than 40% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target of 20% by 1.37% for FFY 2019, for Measurement 5B of this Indicator. Although the VIDE/SOSE did not meet its FFY 2019, there was no slippage when compared to FFY 2018 data.

Measurement C: During FFY 2019, (December 1, 2019, Child Count) twenty-five (25) or (2.44%) out of one thousand and twenty-five (1025) of children with IEPs aged six (6) through twenty-one (21) were in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. The VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded the target of 2.95 by 0.51% for FFY 2019, for Measurement 5C of this Indicator.

For FFY 2019, (December 1, 2019, Child Count Data) the number of school-aged children with IEPs aged six (6) through twenty-one (21) inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements decreased as such the VIDE/SOSE was able to maintain meeting its target for

FFYs 2018 and 2019, for Measurement 5C of this indicator when compared to FFY 2016 and 2017. It is noteworthy to mention that the VIDE/SOSE consistently engages with each District to ensure that the Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams' members continue to discuss and ensure that each child's IEPs is developed with appropriate services to the academic and functional needs of these children receiving special education and related services.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

5 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. Virgin Islands transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the Virgin Islands' data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the Virgin Islands' slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2019	Target >=	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%	94.50%
A	97.44%	Data	94.31%	96.21%	91.67%	91.27%	81.11%
B	2019	Target <=	4.50%	5.50%	4.50%	4.25%	1.19%
B	1.28%	Data	5.69%	3.03%	5.00%	7.14%	12.22%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	97.44%
Target B <=	1.28%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	78
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	76
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	0
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	76	78	81.11%	97.44%	97.44%	Met Target	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1	78	12.22%	1.28%	1.28%	Met Target	N/A

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Measurement A: During FFY 2019, (December 1, 2019, Child Count) seventy-six (76) out of seventy-eight (78) or (97.44%) of children with IEPs aged 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 exceed and exceeded the target for FFY 2019, of 94.5% by 2.44% for Measurement 6A of this Indicator.

Measurement B: During FFY 2019,(December 1, 2019, Child Count) one (1) out of the out of seventy-eight (78) or (1.28%) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) were in a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in a separate special education class. Although the VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target for FFY 2019, of 1.19% by .09%, there was no slippage when compared to FFY 2018 data, for Measurement 6B of this Indicator. Furthermore, for FFY 2019, when compared to FFY 2018, there was an overall decrease of ten (10) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) in a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in a separate special education class.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

In response to OSEP comments and the required actions, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019, for this Indicator.

6 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Reporting requirements for the IDEA section 618 data collection (specifically, IDEA Part B Child Counts and Educational Environments) were updated to allow States to include five-year-olds in Kindergarten in file specification FS002 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) School Age and exclude these children from file specification FS089 - Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Early Childhood for School Year (SY) 2019-20. SY 2019-20 (i.e., FFY 2019) was the transition year for this change; States had the option to report five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 in their SY 2019-20 submission or wait to do so with their SY 2020-21 submission, when the change becomes permanent. The Virgin Islands transitioned to reporting five-year-olds in Kindergarten in FS002 for its SY 2019-20 submission under IDEA section 618. This change impacts the Virgin Islands' data for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6, because the required data source for SPP/APR Indicators 5 and 6 is the same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618. Therefore, the Virgin Islands' slippage status indicates "NA" for this indicator.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2008	Target >=	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%
A1	9.90%	Data	82.76%	76.32%	76.92%	94.44%	100.00%
A2	2008	Target >=	40.00%	40.50%	41.00%	42.00%	42.00%

A2	0.00%	Data	65.06%	51.28%	54.78%	60.00%	77.78%
B1	2008	Target >=	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	68.50%	69.00%
B1	14.10%	Data	75.00%	67.44%	73.68%	75.00%	95.24%
B2	2008	Target >=	32.00%	32.50%	33.00%	33.00%	33.50%
B2	0.00%	Data	51.81%	44.87%	50.43%	56.67%	64.44%
C1	2008	Target >=	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.00%	79.50%
C1	11.30%	Data	89.29%	82.05%	69.49%	72.22%	100.00%
C2	2008	Target >=	40.00%	40.50%	40.50%	41.00%	42.00%
C2		Data	66.27%	50.00%	48.70%	60.00%	75.56%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	71.00%
Target A2 >=	42.50%
Target B1 >=	69.00%
Target B2 >=	33.50%
Target C1 >=	79.50%
Target C2 >=	42.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

45

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	10	22.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	27	60.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	17.78%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	37	37	100.00%	71.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	35	45	77.78%	42.50%	77.78%	N/A	N/A

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	4.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	13	28.89%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	27	60.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3	6.67%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	40	42	95.24%	69.00%	95.24%	Met Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	30	45	64.44%	33.50%	66.67%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	10	22.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	29	64.44%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	6	13.33%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	39	39	100.00%	79.50%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	35	45	75.56%	42.00%	77.78%	Met Target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The VIDE continues to work closely with ECO (which resources and staff have now become a part of the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center) ("ECTA Center") and Department of Human Services, Head Start Programs, Child Observation Records ("COR") online collection data system to obtain and analyze the data for this indicator.

Data for this indicator are collected for all preschool children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) served in Head Start utilizing the COR, and for children served in settings other than Head Start, the VIDE uses the Learning Accomplishment Profile – 3rd Edition (LAP-3) for FFY 2019, the school year 18-19.

The VIDE/SOSE obtains the Child Observation Records (COR) raw scores from the Department of Human Services Head Start Programs throughout the Territory and aggregates the collected data. In addition, when applicable the LAP-3 results for those children receiving special education and related services in environments other than Head Start from each Local Education Agency. Each 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 preschool teachers, to capture entry and exit data for each child. Upon completion of the LAP-3 entry and exit assessments, the LEAs both forward the results for each child to the VIDE/SOSE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE continues to receive technical assistance from Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTEC) and Center for Learning and Development | SRI Education to assist with the calculation for this Indicator The following is the methodology:

The Analysis Procedure is as follows:

1. Averaged across items sets associated with each outcome
 - a. OC1 Questions 5 – 8
 - b. OC2 Questions 17 – 24
 - c. OC3 Questions 1 – 4
2. Computed the difference between the exit and entry average for each outcome.
3. Coded progress categories
 - a. If the exit average was less than the entry average
 - b. If the exit average was greater than or equal to the entry average and the exit average was less than 3.5 and the difference between the two averages was less than .5
 - c. If the exit average was greater than the entry average and the exit average was less than 3.5 and the difference between the two averages was greater than or equal to .5
 - d. If the exit average was greater than the entry average and the entry average was less than 3.5 and the exit average was greater than or equal to 3.5
 - e. If the exit average and the entry average were greater than or equal to 3.5

Child Outcome Categories

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

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

7 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	76.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	82.50%	83.00%	83.00%	83.50%	83.50%
Data	83.49%	85.44%	85.44%	84.68%	84.66%

Targets

FFY	2019

Target >=	83.50%
-----------	--------

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
519	576	84.66%	83.50%	90.10%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

722

Percentage of respondent parents

79.78%

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.

Every parent/guardian of a preschool child, aged three (3) through five (5) and school- aged child aged six (6) through twenty-one (21) is contacted via telephonic contact and are encouraged to respond to the survey. In essence, for FFY 2019, as in previous Federal Fiscal reporting years, the parents surveyed and responded are representative of the demographic of children receiving special education and related services in the United States Virgin Islands. See table

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Composition

Every parent/guardian of a preschool child, aged three (3) through five (5) and school -aged child aged six (6) through twenty-one (21) is contacted via telephonic contact and are encouraged to respond to the survey. In essence, for FFY 2018, as in previous Federal Fiscal reporting years, the parents surveyed and responded are representative of the demographic of children receiving special education and related services in the United States Virgin Islands. See below for this data.

Indicator B8-Demographics of Parents and Children receiving special education services are listed below.

Race/Ethnicity

District 1

- Asian or Pacific Islander*
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*
- Two or More Races *
- White Not Hispanic *
- Black or African American (not Hispanic) -(512)
- Hispanic/Latino -(224)

District 2

- Asian or Pacific Islander*
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*
- Two or More Races *
- White Not Hispanic *
- Black or African American (not Hispanic) -(271)
- Hispanic/Latino -Female (39)

Indicator B8

Gender
District 1

Females-(196)
Males-(576)

District 2

Females-(97)
Males-(217)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Background information

The University of the Virgin Islands (UVI), Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC) has conducted the VIDE's parent satisfaction survey since the beginning of the State Performance Plan (SPP). The VIDE procured services and entered into its ninth (9th) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the ECC to perform the FFY 2019, parental satisfaction survey. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE has maintained the services of the University of the Virgin Islands, Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC) for the quality and expertise demonstrated throughout the years. As such, the VIDE entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of the Virgin Islands, Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC) to conduct telephonic surveys for the collection analysis and generation and public reporting of the results of Indicator 8 "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".

Process/Procedures/Methods

The entire survey process is carried out by the Director of the ECC who is solely responsible for selecting, training, and supervising temporary employees to conduct the telephonic interviews of all parents/guardians of children who receive special education-related services in the St. Croix and St. Thomas-St. John districts. More importantly, the selection process includes a variety of English, Spanish, and French-speaking interviewers. Additionally, each individual hired to conduct the telephonic survey process must take an oral and written confidentiality oath, subsequent to the explanation of the seriousness and consequences if found in violation of the oath which includes dismissal and or prosecution by the Virgin Islands Department of Justice.

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 background information on the reasons for the survey and the necessary training to ensure accurate collection of survey data. Additionally, the Director of the ECC, research analysts and other personnel involved also provide training on the stringent protocols that they have instituted to ensure that all surveys are conducted uniformly so that results are valid and reliable. The VIDE generates a contact listing utilizing the State Student Management System "Goalview" for all parents/guardians with children receiving special education and related services throughout the Territory. Moreover, this listing is transmitted to the ECC to carry-out the telephonic survey collection process. Utilizing the protocols that ECC establishes, attempts are made to call all parents. In addition, to the Goalview generated listing the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE), State Office of Special Education (SOSE) also supplements parental contact information with the assistance of the Virgin Islands Department of Education's Division of Planning, Research Evaluation (PRE), if there are invalid telephone numbers.

The survey is conducted using strict standards that require the interviewer to make calls at various times of the day, including calls during daytime hours, evening hours, weekends, and holidays. Each interviewer has a script, which is rehearsed several times during training, with each person at the training taking turns both conducting and responding to the survey. This is done to ensure that all survey takers are reading the script accurately and fluently. Also, 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 different times, before survey takers may consider a parent or guardian a "non-responder." Telephone calls are made in this way to maximize the chances of reaching parents and guardians at either their residences or places of business. Each parent of a child, ages three (3) through five (5) and ages six (6) through twenty-one (21), is called and encouraged to respond to the survey. In order to gauge the level of parental satisfaction from the respondent parents the ECC utilizes Likert type questions (Strongly Agree, Agree, Strongly Disagree, and Disagree). Upon the digital compilation completion of the telephonic survey, the survey results are tabulated to determine frequencies and percentages. Moreover, the ECC analyzes the raw scores by applying a rigorous methodology with the field on the Item Response Theory (IRT), which converts ordinal level measures to interval level measures for which mathematical operations can be completed.

Additionally, ECC examines the ordinal scores by using the Rach's Rating Scale Model (RRSM) to generate linear levels. Following the data analysis and compilation, ECC prepares and submits a draft report to the SOSE for review. Once the review of the draft report is completed, the ECC compiles the final report and collaborates with the SOSE to confirm the location and date for public dissemination of the survey results. The presentations are hosted and presented in each Local Education Agency (LEA) by the director of ECC and other ECC personnel involved in the survey process. To ensure awareness of the public event SOSE prepares the territorial media notifications and submits them to the Virgin Islands Department of Education, Division of Public Relations for final editing and media publishing. Furthermore, parents/guardians, Virgin Islands Advisory Panel on Special Education (VIAPSE), and other stakeholder groups are encouraged to attend.

Although ECC contacts every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and families who, (a) refuse to respond to the survey, (b) cannot be reached by telephone, (c) moved, (d) failed to update telephone numbers; and (e) do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey. For FFY 2019, as in the past, the parents surveyed and responded are representative of the demographic of children receiving special education and related services in the United States Virgin Islands.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

8 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	2	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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 non-disabled students in that same district is 20% or more. That is, 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 children in that same district), then the district is flagged as having disproportionate representation. If a district exceeds the 20% relative difference threshold in any racial/ethnic composition, they are required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis to determine whether the disproportionate representation, based on a relative difference in composition, is the result of inappropriate identification.

DATA SOURCE

Data Source: The data sources for this Indicator are Public School Student Enrollment Data for All Students by Race and Ethnicity dated September 30, 2019 (School Year 2019-2020), and data collected under IDEA section 618 on December 1, 2019 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended). 618 “Child Count” data are collected via Goalview, the VIDE’s/SOSE’s special education data management system, and reported to the United States Department of Education Office of Special Education Program via the ED Facts online electronic reporting system.

Public school Student enrollment data from PRE and data from the December 1, 2019 Child Count along with the approved mythology were used in determining whether or not a district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Utilizing the data above, the State has determined that District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) meets the minimum “n” of 10 students with disabilities receiving special education and related services for African American/Black students; Multi-Race students, and Hispanic/Latino students. However, District 1 did not exceed the 20% relative difference threshold in any racial/ethnic composition.

District 2 (St. Croix)) met the minimum “n” of 10 students with disabilities receiving special education and related services for African American/Black students; Multi-Race students, and Hispanic/Latino students. The only racial/ethnic group with a relative difference that exceeded the 20% threshold were Two or More Races (Multi-Race) and White. The relative difference for Two or More Races students with disabilities compared with all non-disabled students enrolled in District 1 was 909.415%. In other words, Multi-Race students in District 1 (St. Croix) are 909.415% times more likely to be identified as students with disabilities than the rest of the population, and White students are 60.40% more likely to be identified as students with disabilities than the rest of the population.

To determine whether the disproportionate representation, based on a relative difference in composition is the result of inappropriate identification, the State had District 1 complete a Facilitated Self-Analysis to determine the root cause of the disproportionate representation and to determine if the threshold was due to inappropriate identification or the lack of implementation of policies, practices, and procedures. The Facilitated Self Analysis Assessment (FSA) for Disproportionate Representation highlights the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referrals for Evaluation; Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards.

In addition to the Facilitated Self Analysis, the VIDE/SOSE compliance unit conducted a desk audit of student files, using the Student Management System, to verify that the files contained evidence that the disproportionate representation identified is not a result of inappropriate identification in the specific racial/ethnic categories. Due to the ongoing challenges from the school closure and implementation of the virtual classroom brought on by the COVID-19 Pandemic, the VIDE/SOSE was unable to conduct an on-site verification of randomly selected students' physical files, pursuant to the VIDE/SOSE's compliance monitoring procedures.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	2	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The VIDE/SOSE defines disproportionate representation as a relative difference in composition of 20% or more. 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. In other words, 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 non-disabled students in the same racial or ethnic group in that same district, then the district is considered to have disproportionate representation. The State 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.

Methodology

Public School Student Enrollment (School Year 2019-2020) data from PRE and data from the December 1, 2019 Child Count, along with the approved methodology were used in determining whether or not the districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. A district is flagged as having disproportionate representation when it exceeds the 20% threshold in one of the six disabling categories when compared to other non-disabled children in that ethnic group. Calculations are completed for only those eligibility categories and racial/ethnic categories that meet the minimum “n” size of 10. Therefore, no districts were excluded as a result of using a minimum “n” of 10.

Data Source:

The data sources for this Indicator are Public School Student Enrollment Data for All Students by Race and Ethnicity and data collected under IDEA section 618 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, As Amended). 618 “Child Count” data are collected via Goalview, the VIDE’s/SOSE’s special education data management system, and reported to the United States Department of Education. Office of Special Education via the EDFacts online electronic reporting system. Public school Student enrollment data from PRE dated September 30, 2019, and data from the December 1, 2019 Child Count along with the approved methodology were used in determining whether or not the district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Using the criteria above, District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) had at least the minimum “n” of 10 African American/Black students in five of the six disability categories and at least the minimum “n” of 10 Hispanic/Latino students in one of the disability categories. Based on the calculation for determining disproportionate representation in the disability categories for racial and ethnic groups, none of the racial and ethnic groups exceeded the 20% threshold of over-representation in the disability categories. Thus District 1, is not identified as having disproportionate representation in the racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

District 2 (St. Croix) had at least the minimum “n” of 10 African American/Black students in five of the six disability categories; Hispanic/Latino students had at least the minimum “n” of 10 in one of the disability categories, and Two or More races (Multi) had at least the minimum “n” (10) in one of the disability categories. Based on the calculation for determining disproportionate representation in the disability categories for racial and ethnic groups, Multi-Race/Two or More Races, exceeded the 20% threshold of over-representation by 1,117% in the disability category of Specific Learning Disability.

Pursuant to the State’s compliance monitoring procedures, when a district exceeds the 20% relative difference threshold in any racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, they are required to complete the facilitated self-analysis which covers the following areas: curriculum and instruction/general education interventions; child find; referral for evaluation; evaluation; eligibility and placement; and procedural safeguards.

Additionally, to ensure that the District is correctly implementing specific regulatory requirements and is compliant with IDEA, the State conducted a desk-audit of approximately 48% of students in the racial/ethnic category of African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, and Two or More Races and in the disability category of specific learning disability to ensure that the student’s files contained evidence that the actual practices related to identification were compliant, and also, to ascertain the root cause of the disproportionality identified during the desk audit of June 2020. The student files were viewed using the Student Management System (Goalview).

Based on the student record file review and the district's response to the Facilitated Self Analysis, the State is satisfied that the root cause of the disproportionate representation is not due to inappropriate identification. Furthermore, the students' file documented, and the FSA verified that District 2 (1) engages in progress monitoring for the effectiveness of academic and behavioral interventions, and all students who experience difficulties receive intervention program (e.g. peer tutoring, after school remediation program) and as appropriate, Read 180, iReady, Acellus and PBIS; (2) uses a wide variety of assessment materials to ensure minimal test bias; (3) use of tests and other evaluation materials are administered by trained personnel in conformance with the instructions provided by their producer; (4) all test utilized by the district are tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely designed to provide a single, general intelligence quotient; and (5) if a student is not found eligible for special education services, the staffing procedures require consideration of possible Section 504 referral and/or recommendation for specific follow-up by the parent, teacher or Basis Child Study Team (BCST).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.20%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
160	160	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

0

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The State’s established timeline for initial evaluation is 45 days and is consistent with federal regulations at 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B). All or 100% of those students whose parental consent was obtained during the period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 were evaluated within the 45 days of the state-established timeline.

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

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

Data for Indicator 11 are obtained from two (2) primary sources: (1) Goalview and (2) monthly reports of students referred for initial evaluations which is submitted by the districts. As part of its monitoring, the State developed an internal self-calculating Master Worksheet that is used by the districts in reporting timelines for initial evaluations for students with disabilities. This Worksheet captures all of the data elements for each child referred and is used in reporting timelines for initial evaluations (i.e. Data Report 1.A.1 Initial Evaluation). The State uses this Spreadsheet to compare the information in both data sets to ensure that the Data Report and Goalview are consistent and have the same dates of initial evaluation for each student of whom parental consent was obtained.

Results of Monitoring Activities:

As part of its monitoring activities for the reporting period of July 1, 2019, thru June 30, 2020, desk audits were conducted to verify if the data received from the district for all one hundred and sixty students (160) referred for initial evaluation. The purpose of this desk audit is to verify if the data received from the district regarding initial evaluations are accurate, valid, and reliable. The desk audit comprised of a comparison of the “Data Report I.A-1: Initial Evaluation” and the Student Data Management System (Goalview) to compare the dates in both data sets. The Information found in the Student Data Management System (Goalview) relative to the dates of initial evaluation was consistent with the data submitted by the district for all students referred for initial evaluations and for whom parental consent was received. Based on the desk audits, the districts are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of IDEA in ensuring that all students referred for initial evaluations and for whom parental consent was obtained are evaluated within the State established time-frame of 45 days.

For FFY 2019 (reporting period of July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020, a total of one hundred sixty-one students (161) were referred for initial evaluation. However, of the 161 children referred, one (1) parent refused to grant consent for evaluation. As such, the remaining 160 students were evaluated within the State established time-frame of 45 days. The desk audit results verified that both districts are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for timely evaluation within the state-established timeline of 45 days for Indicator 11: Child Find-Initial Evaluation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	60.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	70.97%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	47
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	14

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.	0
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	33	33	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State monitoring

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

The VIDE/SOSE collects data from each Local Education Agency (LEA) on all children referred from the Part C programs prior to age 3 for eligibility determination under the Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities (IDEA). These data are collected and entered into an internal database developed to capture all the data elements for each child referred. The data elements are as follows: (a) child's name, (b) child's date of birth, (c) date of transition meeting, (d) date child was determined eligible/not eligible, (e) date of IEP development, and (f) the date when services began/or refused by the parent.

Additionally, the data source for this Indicator is (a) the State Monitoring system, (b) State Student Management System ("Goal View"), and (c) State database to house all data for the respective reporting year FFY 2019 (e.g. children born between July 1, 2016, to June 30, 2017). Moreover, VIDE/SOSE conducts desk audits and onsite file verification visits to each Local Education Agency (LEA) and any other necessary onsite activity to validate data submitted monthly to the State on its Part C to B Monthly Transition Reports.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were an additional ten (10) children not "a, b, c, d, or e". who were provided services in Part C and referred to Part B prior to their 3rd birthdays; however, three (3) children parent's refused services, (b) three (3) children's transition conference meetings where not able to be scheduled by the Part C programs, (c) three (3) children's parents no-showed for scheduled transition conference meetings, and (d) one (1) child's parents were prohibited from embarking to the Territory due to COVID-19 travel-related restrictions.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.73%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
295	295	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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.

For FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE collected data from the state student management system GoalView to create an internal spreadsheet consisting of all students with IEPs who are age 16 and over from July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020. The VIDE/SOSE then conducted desk audit reviews of the IEPs of each student 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 section 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 is marked ("no") for not compliant.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators by engaging in ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners thus building capacity and guiding its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	23.00%	23.50%	24.00%	24.00%	25.00%
A	19.00%	Data	22.89%	25.97%	24.14%	23.53%	26.15%
B	2009	Target >=	60.50%	60.50%	60.50%	61.00%	62.00%
B	59.00%	Data	46.99%	68.83%	68.97%	73.53%	72.31%
C	2009	Target >=	81.00%	81.00%	81.50%	81.50%	82.00%
C	80.00%	Data	87.95%	83.12%	82.76%	82.35%	83.08%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	25.00%
Target B >=	62.00%
Target C >=	83.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

FFY 2019 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	51
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	13

2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	26
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)	7
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

Measure	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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	13	51	26.15%	25.00%	25.49%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	39	51	72.31%	62.00%	76.47%	Met Target	No Slippage
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)	46	51	83.08%	83.00%	90.20%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

In FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE obtained demographic information (students', parent/guardians' name and contact information, telephone numbers for students and their parents/guardians, the date that the student graduated or exited school, and mailing address) from the State student data system ("GoalView") and the Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (PR&E). The SOSE in June of 2020, one (1) year after students left school mails a survey to every student with an IEP who graduated or otherwise exited school at the end of 2019-2020 school year (including leavers from the end of 2020 summer session).

The SOSE uses a written survey with multiple-choice questions that are mailed with a letter, which request that student or their family complete and return the survey to the SOSE in a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The SOSE mailed 89 surveys in June of 2020 to students who left school after the end of the 2019-2020 school year (including summer session). The VIDE/SOSE was able to collect responses from mailed and telephonic surveys for 51 out of the 89 leavers for a 57.30% response rate. The VIDE/SOSE was not able to contact all students because of outdated demographic information, such as, wrong mailing addresses, invalid phone numbers, disconnected telephones, and or families whose contact information were not updated due to relocation out of the territory.

The SOSE conducted an item analysis using the State PSO calculator on gender, graduation/exiting status, race/ethnicity, and disability category of the 51 responders. The SOSE item analysis for all responders produced valuable data and display counts and representativeness for subgroups in each demographic category. For instance, the percentages of the responder were as follows; from the 51 responders, 30 were in the SLD category for a respondent representation of 58.82%. 21 of the responders were among the 5 disability categories ranging from Autism, Emotional Behavior Disorder, Intellectual Disorder, and Other Health Impairments for respondent representativeness of 41.18% from a 62.75% target leaver representation; 57.69% of respondents were female; 58.06% responders were in the minority/ethnicity category (not white/non-Hispanic); 32.35% of the responders out of 48.98% from the dropout target leaver representation responded to the survey.

For FFY 2019, as in the past, the families and students surveyed and responded (51 out of 89) are representative of the demographic of youth in the United States Virgin Islands who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During FFY 2019, the VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators by engaging in ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners thus building capacity and guiding its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The VIDOE did not, as required by the measurement table, provide targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

As required by the measurement table, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator.

14 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands provided its FFY 2019 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	1
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2008	100.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	85.00%				
Data	100.00%	100.00%			100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	1	100.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State is not required to report if there were less than 10 due process and/or resolution sessions during the reporting period.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2019. The Virgin Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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)))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Advisory Panel for Special Education (VIAPSE) is the primary stakeholder group for the VIDE/SOSE. In April 2017, new members were selected and officers were selected by members to various subcommittees to serve on the panel. Members, who are appointed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, serve a term of three years. The Advisory Panel is comprised of members that are 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. Additionally, key internal and external stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input on the targets for the SPP.

The VIAPSE's primary purpose is to advise the VIDE/SOSE on the provision of special education and related services for children with disabilities. For FFY 2019, Stakeholders-VIAPSE and other VIDE internal stakeholders were provided with data for results and compliance Indicators. The VIDE/SOSE requested its Stakeholders to review data provide suggestions and feedback on various approaches/strategies to improve results specifically for all Indicators. Some of these suggestions included: (e.g. career exploration, social media platform, heighten community engagement). In addition, recommendations for targets for the remaining years of the SPP/APR was requested and discussed.

For FFY 2016 and 2017 panel members received professional development training from the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE), which enhanced their advisory role and developed committees and activities that will support special education through students and family engagement.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	81.20%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	90.00%				

Data					
------	--	--	--	--	--

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State is not required to report if there were less than 10 mediation sessions during the reporting period.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The Virgin Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

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.

Select the certifier's role:

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

Title:

State Director of Special Education

Email:

renee.charleswell@vide.vi

Phone:

(340)-774-0100

Submitted on:

04/28/21 1:36:01 PM