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# 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(VIDOE), like all other State Educational Agencies (“SEAs”), is required to establish and maintain an effective system of general supervision under 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, discussed in the preceding section of this document. The State Office of Special Education (“SOSE”) as the SEA, is required, according 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 Improvement 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 noted in the VIDE/SOSE’s State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) submitted in February 2021 (FFY2019), the VIDE continued to experience the ongoing effects of the COVID-19 National pandemic, as such for FFY 2020 (2020-21 school year) the VIDE continued with a virtual instructional model for students with and without disabilities.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

Data on Processes and Results:   
  
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 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. These training sessions are provided to SOSE and to 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, 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 VIDE’s Student Information System (SIS) “PowerSchool”. This comprehensive Student Information System serves as the VIDE 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 events and the accompanying incidences. The State Office of Special Education, Part B Data Manager works closely with personnel from the PRE and directors of Data and Assessment in each district. to access data needed for 618 special education reporting such as assessment, enrollment, discipline, and additional school-level demographic data and iReady diagnostic 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.**

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 IDEIA. This Plan describes how the Territory will improve implementation of the IDEIA 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 target of its seventeen (17) indicators 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 IDEIA. In FFY 2013, the SPP and APR were merged into one document and it was 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 will be utilized.   
  
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 in sharing the current progress with meeting targets with internal and external stakeholders, the Virgin Islands Panel on Special Education (VIAPSE), and evaluating implementation for each indicator. More importantly, the VIDE/SOSE engages Stakeholders/Advisory Panel Members in the annual development of the SPP/APR. 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. Until FFY 2019 the SSIP was reported annually in April however, for FFY 2020 In April 2020, the FFY 2018 reporting of Phase IV, year 6 implementation of the SSIP.  
  
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 IDEIA 2004 and are designed and being revised to ensure that all eligible children with disabilities continue to receive 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 set forth in VISER. Within the dispute resolution system, the regulations contained in VISER form the basis for the decisions made as a result of dispute resolution activities such as due process hearings.  
In addition to the VISER, the VIDE/SOSE supported the two LEAs in developing Territorial Special Education Procedures to support the LEAs in uniformly implementing the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, as amended in 2004 (IDEIA 2004), and the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s Special Education Rules, as Amended in 2009 (VISER). 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 Results-Focused Monitoring System (CIRFMS) 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 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 support 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 Results 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.**

The VIDE/SOSE provides differentiated technical assistance to each LEA to support them in achieving and maintaining the regulatory requirements of IDEIA. More importantly, to assist them in implementing programs, practices, and instructional strategies that lead to improved outcomes for children/youth with disabilities. Information and technical assistance are carried out and shared via email, conference calls, and face-to-face meetings.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE provides general technical assistance(GTA) to administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and other educational personnel in both LEAs on research-based topics that impact special education in general. These (GTA) includes but is not limited to VIDE/SOSE’s special education management system (Goalview), local budget applications, and the annual performance and areas for improvement of specific Indicators within the VIDE/SOSE’s APR or areas of concern derived from qualitative or quantitative data. LEAs are encouraged and also reserve the right to request additional TA in identified areas of need. The Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) provides a portal to SOSE on the department’s main website. This portal is utilized for posting information for public viewing and Office of Special Education Programs(OSEP) public reporting requirements.  
  
Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) is based on LEA and school-level data and needs, and it is more customized than GTA. The VIDE/SOSE uses LEA data from the SPP/APR indicators as well as other monitoring activities to identify technical assistance needs. Participation in TTA activities may be voluntary, however; participation may also be required as in the case of TTA that is required as a part of an LEA's CAP that is developed secondary to the identification of noncompliance Both LEAs has and continues to receive targeted TTA related to meeting the secondary transition requirements reported in Indicators 4, 9, 10, 12, and 13 of the SPP/APR.

**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 children with disabilities.**

Professional Development System:  
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. Prior to the COVID-19 National Pandemic most professional learning occurs occurred on-site through in face-to-face professional development sessions. Although the VIDE did not reestablish the customary full school day and in-person, professional development activities during the 2020-21 school the VIDE/SOSE was able to provide professional development opportunities on a smaller scale to school base personnel. however, the VIDE/SOSE continues to collaborate with the LEAs to investigate ways to improve online learning accessibility for teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals. 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.  
  
For many years, a significant amount of professional development has focused on meeting the requirements related to secondary transition as reported in Indicator 13. SOSE personnel obtained training from the National Technical Assistance Center (NTAC) and then customized this training for district personnel. The VIDE/SOSE continues to work diligently to identify and provide heightened professional development to teachers and other school-based personnel in each LEA related to APR indicators, including its SSIP.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level and content expert, early childhood personnel, district directors, supervisors, and coordinators, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic team members, private business sector, interagency partners, and other outside and linking agencies.   
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

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

NO

**Number of Parent Members:**

8

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The VIDE/SOSE views and values our stakeholders as an integral part of the community at-large. Since the inception of the State’s SPP/APR, Stakeholders have been a primary mechanism for disseminating, analyzing, and developing strategies and revisions across all SPP/APR indicators. The components of the State’s Stakeholders group continues to be expanded as such the broadening of the scope for soliciting input, developing improvement strategies and evaluating progress required a more equitable representation. Thus ensuring the representativeness of the demographic of a segment of the population such as parents of students with disabilities that receives special services is the impetus for the development of the newly revised broad indicator cluster stakeholders group.  
  
In FFY 2019, parent stakeholder members which are part of the State’s broad stakeholder groups and the general public were invited to participate in the dissemination of data collected through the UVI/ECC State’s Parental Satisfaction Survey. This method of presentation is one of various components the State’s utilizes to inform its stakeholders of the progress and outcomes on the delivery of services for CWD. The presentation offered the general public and parents and broad stakeholder groups with data and analyzes of some 70 items that are classified into 10 groups or subscales, each of which addresses a particular aspect of parental satisfaction. Another method to disseminate information to stakeholders was the results of the State’s FFY 2019 CIRFMS, the data collected during this phase of supervision provided stakeholders with valuable information on the outcomes of the State’s results indicators as well as enabled every member of the indicator cluster groups a close-up look at how each cluster informs the delivery of services for CWD.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

For FFY 2020, The VIDE/SOSE Broad Indicator Cluster Stakeholders Group reconvened to discuss, analyze, and develop improvement strategies for optimum performance and compliance. The groups were provided with data from the State’s FFY 2019 SPP/APR, Districts Profiles, CIRFMS, Annual Parental Satisfaction Survey, and District’s Determination. Each cluster group were required to complete a performance metrics to formulate activities for improving outcomes for CWD. Stakeholders for each indicator cluster were assigned to participate in various subgroups to analyze and develop strategies for approval by broad stakeholders. Meetings with timelines for approval of strategies and targets were reconvened quarterly.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE Broad Indicator Cluster Stakeholder Group communication is an integral part in keeping everyone informed. Communication and Convening through electronic means for garnering input since the onset of the Covid-19 Pandemic has been through the virtual platform. Meeting invites along with agendas are sent electronically as well as other documents as needed, to achieve the meeting goals and outcomes. All meetings are formatted to include a welcoming remark, recording of attendees, review of current agenda, and finally a review of any prior business or agenda items. The meetings are recorded for reference as needed.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Mechanism for input from VIDE/SOSE Broad Indicator Cluster Stakeholders Group:  
1. Continuous Improvement and Results Focus Monitoring System (CIRFMS) (Report generated and disseminated on March of current school calendar)  
2. District Performance Profiles (Report generated and disseminated on September of current school calendar)  
3. Quarterly Broad Stakeholder Meetings (Meetings on March, June, September, December of current school calendar)  
4. VIAPSE Meetings (Meetings on February, May, August, November of current school calendar)  
5. Districts’ Annual Determination (Report generated and disseminated on September of current school calendar)  
6. Annual Parental Satisfaction Survey (Report generated and disseminated annually during the spring of current school calendar)

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The VIDE/SOSE will continue to utilize the activities listed in Table D of the SSIP as the mechanism and roadmap for implementation evaluation criteria for state-level activities. These mechanisms include, but are not limited to engaging strategically with other VIDE programs, Territory linking agencies, LEAs, and external organizations/ programs/groups, including family and community groups to increase stakeholder engagement in educational decision making. These activities will occur quarterly, as well as on an as-need basis.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

As required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A) the VIDE/SOSE’s public reporting for FFY 2019 of each LEAs performance can be accessed on the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s homepage web portal www.vide.vi homepage by first clicking the "Our Divisions" tab, then clicking on Special Education. In addition to each LEA performance, public access is available for a complete copy of the State’s SPP, which includes newly set targets.

## Intro - Prior FFY 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.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The VIDE/SOSE notes and has made the attachments available. These can be found by doing the following: go to the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s homepage web portal www.vide.vi homepage by first clicking the "Our Divisions" tab, then clicking on Special Education.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the Virgin Islands' IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 54.63% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 35.00% | 38.00% | 41.00% | 44.00% | 44.50% |
| Data | 48.39% | 52.58% | 53.21% | 49.53% | 46.99% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 54.63% | 55.00% | 55.50% | 56.00% | 56.50% | 57.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2020, VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on indicator clusters to ensure expert representation in all target areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of students with disabilities, grade level and content experts in secondary transition, regular and special education personnel, district directors, coordinators, supervisors, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic team members, private business sector, interagency partners, and other outside and linking agencies. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholders into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Stakeholders were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance, ensuring quality services, and measuring outcomes for CWD.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to revise the 2009 Baseline Target with the 2020 Baseline Target calculated based on the current data source for this indicator and make recommendations for revising targets using the Exiting Data reported under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009. The Transition Clusters Stakeholder Group made recommendations for revision of targets for this indicator that demonstrate improvement over the 5 year targets from 2020-2025.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 59 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 15 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 33 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 59 | 108 | 46.99% | 54.63% | 54.63% | N/A | N/A |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

The requirements for all students to graduate with a high school diploma, including students with disabilities, are a 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 clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE used the 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.  
  
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21).  
  
Calculation: 59 / 108 x 100= 54.63%  
  
During FFY 2020, 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.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (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 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[2]](#footnote-3)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 30.56% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 4.25% | 4.00% | 3.75% | 3.75% | 3.75% |
| Data | 4.98% | 5.14% | 7.64% | 6.80% | 5.37% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 30.56% | 29.00% | 28.00% | 27.00% | 26.00% | 25.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2020, VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on indicator clusters to ensure expert representation in all target areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of students with disabilities, grade level and content experts in secondary transition, regular and special education personnel, district directors, coordinators, supervisors, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic team members, private business sector, interagency partners, and other outside and linking agencies. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholders into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Stakeholders were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance, ensuring quality services, and measuring outcomes for CWD.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to revise the 2009 Baseline Target with the 2020 Baseline Target calculated based on the current data source for this indicator and make recommendations for revising targets using the Exiting Data reported under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009. The Transition Clusters Stakeholder Group made recommendations for revision of targets for this indicator that demonstrate improvement over the 5 year targets from 2020-2025.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 59 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 15 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 1 |
| SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/26/2021 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 33 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 33 | 108 | 5.37% | 30.56% | 30.56% | N/A | N/A |

**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.**

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

The VIDE/SOSE will report the data for this indicator as the data used for reporting under section 618 and using the same definition as in EDFacts file specification FS009.  
  
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 enables the LEA to accurately report students status. 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 2020, 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

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Reading | C | Grade HS |  |  |
| Math | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Math | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Math | C | Grade HS |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (3,5 and SSIP) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities grade level and content experts (state and district assessment personnel), school administrators, early childhood personnel, district directors, and coordinators.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | 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.**

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

For FFY 2020 (the school year 2020-21), and as a result of the Centers for Disease Control Prevention(CDC) and Virgin Islands Department of Health (VIDOH) national emergency guidelines relating to the COVID-19 Pandemic National Emergency, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; according to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, Assessments were only administered only for informational purposes. Thus, this resulted in the VIDE/SOSE’s inability to have a baseline and target data for this indicator and report on the participation rate for students with IEPs or to determine whether or not slippage occurred.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, Virgin Islands did not report any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.   
  
Virgin Islands provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the Virgin Islands has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3A - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Reading | C | Grade HS |  |  |
| Math | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Math | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Math | C | Grade HS |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (3,5 and SSIP) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities grade level and content experts (state and district assessment personnel), school administrators, early childhood personnel, district directors, and coordinators.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | 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.**

For FFY 2020 (the school year 2020-21), and as a result of the Centers for Disease Control Prevention(CDC) and Virgin Islands Department of Health (VIDOH) national emergency guidelines relating to the COVID-19 Pandemic National Emergency, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; according to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, Assessments were only administered only for informational purposes. Thus, this resulted in the VIDE/SOSE’s inability to have a baseline and target data for this indicator and on the proficiency rate (on grade-level academic achievement standards) or to determine whether or not slippage occurred.

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

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, Virgin Islands did not report any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.   
  
Virgin Islands provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the Virgin Islands has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3B - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Reading | C | Grade HS |  |  |
| Math | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Math | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Math | C | Grade HS |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (3,5 and SSIP) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level and content experts (state and district assessment personnel), school administrators, early childhood personnel, district directors, and coordinators.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | 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.**

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

For FFY 2020 (the school year 2020-21), and as a result of the Centers for Disease Control Prevention(CDC) and Virgin Islands Department of Health (VIDOH) national emergency guidelines relating to the COVID-19 Pandemic National Emergency, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; according to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, Assessments were only administered only for informational purposes. Thus, this resulted in the VIDE/SOSE’s inability to have baseline and target data for this indicator and report on the proficiency (on alternate academic achievement standards) rate or to determine whether or not slippage occurred.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, Virgin Islands did not report any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.   
  
Virgin Islands provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the Virgin Islands has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3C - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Reading | C | Grade HS |  |  |
| Math | A | Grade 4 |  |  |
| Math | B | Grade 8 |  |  |
| Math | C | Grade HS |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (3,5 and SSIP) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level and content experts (state and district assessment personnel), school administrators, early childhood personnel, district directors, and coordinators.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment |  |  |  |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment |  |  |  |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment |  |  |  |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| **B** | Grade 8 |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |

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

For FFY 2020 (the school year 2020-21), and as a result of the Centers for Disease Control Prevention(CDC) and Virgin Islands Department of Health (VIDOH) national emergency guidelines relating to the COVID-19 Pandemic National Emergency, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; according to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, Assessments were only administered only for informational purposes. Thus, this resulted in the VIDE/SOSE’s inability to have baseline and target data for this indicator and report on the gap in proficiency rate (grade-level academic achievement standards) or determine whether or not slippage occurred.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, Virgin Islands did not report any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.   
  
Virgin Islands provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the Virgin Islands has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 3D - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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, LEAs 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 LEAs 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input, the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (4A, 4B, 9 and 10) to ensure representation in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities grade level and content experts (state and district assessment personnel), school administrators, early childhood personnel, district directors, and coordinators.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs in the State** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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**

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 are obtained from the Department of Education, Division of Planning, Research & Evaluation on September 2019 and the December 1, 2019 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 2019-2020. As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the State conducted a desk audit for FFY 2020 of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the School Year of 2019-2020.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the targets for this indicator and made recommendations for revision that will demonstrate improvement over the 5 year targets from 2020-2025. The respective stakeholder cluster Group newly revised target also demonstrates improvement over the 2010 Baseline data.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 2021 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 four (4) of the six (6) students suspended during the 2019-2020 school year. However, there was evidence of a Manifestation Determination hearing for the two (2) remaining 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)

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 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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.

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

Data Sources  
  
Data are obtained from the Department of Education, Division of Planning, Research & Evaluation on September 2019 and the December 1, 2019 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 2019-2020. As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the State conducted a desk audit for FFY 2020 of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the School Year of 2019-2020.  
  
Results  
Based on discipline data from the school year 2019-2020, which is used in determining significant discrepancy for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR due February 2022, 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 2019-2020 school year. Of the 4 students suspended, the desk audit conducted revealed the following: (a) one (1) out of the four (4) students exited through graduation; and, (b) the remaining three (3) students suspended during the 2019-2020 school year are shown as actively enrolled for the 2020-2021 school year. The desk audit conducted verified the implementation of a Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan and Manifestation Determination by the district for three (3) of the four (4) students, whereas the remaining one student had an incomplete Behavioral Intervention Plan and Manifestation Determination. Additionally, only two (2) of the four (4) students had a Notice of Suspension uploaded in the student management system. Goalview. Hence, the district is showing significant improvement in 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 six (6) students with disabilities were subject to disciplinary removals for greater than ten (10) days in the 2019-2020 school year. The desk audit conducted by the State revealed the following: (a) two (2) of the six (6) students exited through graduation during the 2020-2021 school year; (b) one (1) student exited through graduation during the 2019-2020 school year; (c) one (1) student exited through parental withdrawal; (d) one (1) student was not enrolled in the special education program nor receiving special education services at the time of his suspension as a result of parental withdrawal during the first semester of the 2019-2020 school year; and the one (1) remaining student had a change of placement to a separate school.   
  
The desk audit conducted also verified evidence of the implementation of a Functional Behavioral Assessment Plan and Behavior Intervention Plan and Manifestation Determination by the district for four (4) of the six (6) students. There was evidence however of a Manifestation Determination hearing for the remaining two (2) 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 2020 using 2019-2020 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 2019-2020. 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)

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 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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**

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 52.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% | 56.00% | 58.44% |
| A | 58.44% | Data | 54.42% | 56.44% | 57.30% | 57.60% | 58.44% |
| B | 2019 | Target <= | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 21.37% |
| B | 21.37% | Data | 17.40% | 18.19% | 19.61% | 22.38% | 21.37% |
| C | 2019 | Target <= | 3.05% | 3.05% | 3.05% | 2.95% | 2.44% |
| C | 2.44% | Data | 3.53% | 3.64% | 3.98% | 2.87% | 2.44% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 58.89% | 58.89% | 58.89% | 59.00% | 59.00% | 59.00% |
| Target B <= | 20.30% | 20.30% | 20.30% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% |
| Target C <= | 2.63% | 2.63% | 2.63% | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.40% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (3,5 and SSIP) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level and content experts (state and district assessment personnel), school administrators, early childhood personnel, district directors, and coordinators.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the targets for Measurement C of this indicator and made recommendations for revision that will demonstrate improvement over the 5 year targets from 2020-2025 for this indicator. The respective stakeholder cluster Group newly revised target for this measurement demonstrate improvement over the 2009 Baseline data as required.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 990 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 583 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 201 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 16 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 10 |
| SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/07/2021 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) 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 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 583 | 990 | 58.44% | 58.89% | 58.89% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 201 | 990 | 21.37% | 20.30% | 20.30% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 26 | 990 | 2.44% | 2.63% | 2.63% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

Indicator 5  
Measurement A: During FFY 2020, (December 1, 2020, Child Count) five hundred and eighty-three (583) or (58.89%) out of nine hundred and ninety (990) of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 were in the regular class for more than 80% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded the target of 58.44% by .45% for FFY 2020.   
  
Measurement B: During FFY 2020, (December 1, 2020, Child Count) two hundred and one (201) or (20.30%) out of nine hundred and ninety (990) of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through twenty-one (21) were in the regular class less than 40% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE met the target of 20% by 1.37% for FFY 2020.  
  
Measurement C: During FFY 2020,(December 1, 2020, Child Count) twenty-six (26) or (2.63%) out of nine hundred and ninety (990) of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through twenty-one (21) were in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target of 2.44 by .19% for FFY 2020, thus resulting in slippage for Measurement 5C of this Indicator.   
  
Although the VIDE/SOSE did not meet its target for FFY 2020, (December 1, 2020, Child Count Data) the number of school-aged children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through twenty-one (21) inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements the number total number for Measurement C increased only by one(1) when compared to FFY 2019. Additionally, the total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through twenty-one (21) receiving special education and related services for FFY 2020 (December 1, 2020, Child Count Data) inside the regular class less than 40% of the school day to FFY 2020, decreased by eighteen (18). It is noteworthy to mention that the VIDE/SOSE has decreased the number of children for Measurement B of this indicator when compared to FFY 2019.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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**

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).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 IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input relative to performance and targets the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (6 and 7) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level, and content expert, regular and special education early childhood and elementary school personnel, school counselors, school administrators, district directors and coordinators, educational diagnostic team members, and outside and linking agencies.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the data for Measurement C of this indicator. The respective stakeholder cluster Group will review indicator data and set baseline and targets for this new measurement for Indicator 6 at the time when there are ten or more children who receive special education and related services in the home.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 97.44% |
| **B** | 2020 | 1.28% |
| **C** | 2020 | 1.28% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 97.44% | 97.44% | 97.44% | 97.44% | 97.50% | 97.50% |
| Target B <= | 1.28% | 1.28% | 1.28% | 1.25% | 1.25% | 1.25% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 45 | 33 | 0 | 78 |
| 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 | 44 | 33 | 0 | 77 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 | 77 | 78 | 97.44% | 97.44% | 98.72% | N/A | N/A |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 0 | 78 | 1.28% | 1.28% | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |
| C. Home | 1 | 78 |  | 0.00% | 1.28% | N/A | N/A |

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

Measurement A: During FFY 2020, seventy-seven (77) out of seventy-eight (78) or (98.72%) 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 the target for FFY 2020 of 97.44% by 1.28% for Measurement 6A of this Indicator.   
  
Measurement B: During FFY 2020, zero (0) out of seventy-eight (78) or (0%) 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. The VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded the target for FFY 2020 of 1.28%.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE has set baseline for Measurement C of this indicator. The VIDE/SOSE had fewer than ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home. As such, the Virgin Islands is not required to provide targets for Indicator 6C until any fiscal year in which ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the data for Measurement C of this indicator. The respective stakeholder cluster Group will review indicator data and set targets for this new measurement for Indicator 6 at the time when there are ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for Indicator 6A and Indicator 6B, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten children receiving special education and related services in the home in FFY 2020. Virgin Islands is not required to provide baseline data or targets for Indicator 6C until any fiscal year in which ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.

## 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** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 67.00% | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% | 71.00% |
| A1 | 9.90% | Data | 76.32% | 76.92% | 94.44% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 40.50% | 41.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.50% |
| A2 | 12.00% | Data | 51.28% | 54.78% | 60.00% | 77.78% | 77.78% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 68.00% | 68.50% | 68.50% | 69.00% | 69.00% |
| B1 | 14.10% | Data | 67.44% | 73.68% | 75.00% | 95.24% | 95.24% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 32.50% | 33.00% | 33.00% | 33.50% | 33.50% |
| B2 | 16.00% | Data | 44.87% | 50.43% | 56.67% | 64.44% | 66.67% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 78.50% | 79.00% | 79.00% | 79.50% | 79.50% |
| C1 | 11.30% | Data | 82.05% | 69.49% | 72.22% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 40.50% | 40.50% | 41.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% |
| C2 | 13.00% | Data | 50.00% | 48.70% | 60.00% | 75.56% | 77.78% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 40.00% | 40.00% | 40.50% | 40.50% | 40.50% | 41.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 62.50% | 62.50% | 62.50% | 63.00% | 63.00% | 63.50% |
| Target B1 >= | 40.00% | 40.00% | 40.00% | 40.50% | 40.50% | 41.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 57.14% | 57.14% | 57.14% | 57.50% | 57.50% | 58.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 65.22% | 65.20% | 65.20% | 65.20% | 65.50% | 65.50% |
| Target C2 >= | 56.25% | 56.30% | 56.30% | 56.30% | 56.50% | 56.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input relative to performance and targets the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (6 and 7) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level, and content expert, regular and special education early childhood and elementary school personnel, school counselors, school administrators, district directors and coordinators, educational diagnostic team members, and outside and linking agencies.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

32

**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 | 2 | 25.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 12.50% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 0 | 0.00% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 25.00% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 3 | 37.50% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2 | 5 | 100.00% | 40.00% | 40.00% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 5 | 8 | 77.78% | 62.50% | 62.50% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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 | 3 | 42.86% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 0 | 0.00% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 28.57% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2 | 28.57% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 2 | 5 | 95.24% | 40.00% | 40.00% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 4 | 7 | 66.67% | 57.14% | 57.14% | 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 | 1 | 3.13% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 7 | 21.88% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 6 | 18.75% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 9 | 28.13% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 9 | 28.13% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 15 | 23 | 100.00% | 65.22% | 65.22% | 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.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 18 | 32 | 77.78% | 56.25% | 56.25% | 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.**

In previous years, the VIDOHHSP utilizes the Child Observation Records (“COR”) online collection data system to obtain the performance (entrance and exit) for all preschool children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) enrolled served in Head Start Preschool Programs. The COR utilized a zero(0)-five (5) -point scale for scoring. However, in the school year 2021-22, the VIDOHHSP began to use the Child Observation Records (COR) Advantage which uses a seven (7) point level scoring range. These scoring levels are listed in the latter part of this section. This data is extracted from the online system and forwarded to the VIDE/SOSE for data analysis and tabulation and tabulation and tabulation and analyze the data for this indicator.   
  
Procedures   
  
The VIDE/SOSE obtains the Child Observation Records, COR Advantage raw scores from the Department of Human Services Head Start Programs throughout the Territory and aggregates the collected data.   
  
Listed below are the levels and the accompanying age of functioning for each of the levels.   
  
Level Functioning age level   
  
Zero (0) Infant  
One (1) One-year-old  
Two (2) Two-year-old   
Three (3) Three-year-old  
Four (4) Four- year-old  
Five (5) Five-year-old  
Six (6) Six-year-old   
Seven (7) Seven-year-old   
  
  
  
The VIDE/SOSE uses the above numerical values to determine progress in each of the outcome areas. along with the publisher’s online analysis to determine progress. In addition, the VIDOHHSP noted that children who participate in Early Head Start Programs are expected to enter Preschool programs at Level three (3). Moreover, according to the VIDOHHS Preschool programs children exiting Head Start Programs and who are Kindergarten ready should be at a Level five (5) or six (6).

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

The VIDE/SOSE defines “comparable to same-age peers” as the approximate capabilities of children of a given age, across a variety of settings and situations, by however those capabilities can be demonstrated. Functioning comparable to same-age level peers is not to be determined by only a single score on a norm-referenced test or any other single assessment, Although such scores when used in conjunction with other sources of information could inform a decision on the child’s status with regard to an outcome or how much progress a child has made. This definition was adopted from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO).  
  
The VIDOHS noted that the ongoing impact of COVID-19 (e.g.virtual instruction, limited at home resources/infrastructure.IT support) impacted the data collection and completeness of the administration of COR advantage online tool for all children enrolled in the Head Start program during the 2020-21 school year of child outcome data. For this reason, the VIDE/SOSE established a sixty percent (60%) threshold for data completeness for each individual outcome area, for a higher level of reliability. The VIDE/SOSE will continue to work closely with the VIDOHHSP to identify challenges and provide support.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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**

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input relative to performance and targets the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (8, 11, and 12) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level and content experts, regular and special education early childhood and elementary school personnel, school counselors, school administrators, district directors and coordinators, educational diagnostic team members, and outside and linking agencies.  
  
For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE invited newly selected/appointed members to its virtual stakeholder meeting to include prior members, to the redesigned structure of its stakeholder groups. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholder group structure into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Attendees were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 76.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 83.00% | 83.00% | 83.50% | 83.50% | 83.50% |
| Data | 85.44% | 85.44% | 84.68% | 84.66% | 90.10% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 79.71% | 79.71% | 80.00% | 80.00% | 80.50% | 80.50% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 334 | | 419 | 90.10% | 79.71% | 79.71% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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.**

The State uses one survey instrument to collect data for children ages 3-5 and six (6) through twenty-one (21). To ensure that the data is valid and reliable, the VIDE/SOSE generates a contact listing utilizing the State Student Management System “Goalview” for all parents/guardians of children receiving special education and related services that include each child’s age which is the determining factor to discern the specific related questions (e.g, a child that is three-years-old his/her parent will be asked those questions specifically for preschool and the same for school-aged children.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

419

**Percentage of respondent parents**

100.00%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 79.78% | 100.00% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The VIDE/SOSE has not identified any group that has been underrepresented.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

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 in a uniform manner so that results are valid and reliable. The VIDE/SOSE 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. In addition, there are a prescribed number of attempts that must be made before the parent or guardian is considered a “non-responder.” No less than ten (10) attempts must be made on various days and at 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. This ensures all parents of children receiving special education and related services are contacted, which eliminates any chance of nonresponse biases. at either their residences or places of business.

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

The parents surveyed and responded are representative of the demographic of children and youth receiving special education and related services in the United States Virgin Islands. See data below.  
  
Race Ethnicity  
  
District 1  
Asian or Pacific Islander--\*\*\*less than 30  
Black or African American (not Hispanic) --426  
Hispanic/Latino--182  
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander--\*\*\*less than 30  
Two or More Races--\*\*\*less than 30   
White (not Hispanic) -- \*\*\*less than 30   
  
District 2  
Asian or Pacific Islander--\*\*\*less than 30  
Black or African American (not Hispanic) --489  
Hispanic/Latino--62  
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander--\*\*\*less than 30  
Two or More Races--\*\*\*less than 30   
White (not Hispanic) -- \*\*\*less than 30   
  
Disability Category  
District 1  
Autism--69  
Developmental Delayed--40  
Intellectual Disabilities--36  
Hearing Impairments--\*\*\*less than 30  
Speech or Language Impairments--\*\*\*less than 30  
Emotional Disturbance--\*\*\*less than 30  
Orthopedic Impairments --\*\*\*less than 30  
Specific Learning Disabilities--341  
Deaf-Blindness--\*\*\*less than 30  
Multiple Disabilities--\*\*\*less than 30  
Traumatic Brain Injury --\*\*\*less than 30  
Other Health Impairments--67   
Visual Impairments--\*\*\*less than 30  
  
District 2  
Autism--61  
Developmental Delayed--52  
Intellectual Disabilities--42  
Hearing Impairments--\*\*\*less than 30  
Speech or Language Impairments--77  
Emotional Disturbance--\*\*\*less than 30  
Orthopedic Impairments --\*\*\*less than 30  
Specific Learning Disabilities--233  
Deaf-Blindness--\*\*\*less than 30  
Multiple Disabilities--\*\*\*less than 30  
Traumatic Brain Injury --\*\*\*less than 30  
Other Health Impairments--52  
Visual Impairments--\*\*\*less than 30

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

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 is encouraged to respond to the survey. In essence, for FFY 2020, as in previous Federal Fiscal reporting years, the parents surveyed and responded is representative of the demographic of children receiving special education and related services in the United States Virgin Islands. Refer to the data in the section above. In addition, there are a prescribed number of attempts that must be made before the parent or guardian is considered a “non-responder.” No less than ten (10) attempts must be made on various days and at different times before survey takers may consider a parent or guardian a “non-responder.” Telephone attempts are done this way to help maximize the chances of reaching parents and guardians. This ensures all parents of children receiving special education and related services are contacted, which eliminates any chance of non-response biases. Calls are made to parents either at their residences or places of business. The lower response rate for FFY 2020 can be attributed to the fact there was an increase in disconnected telephone numbers during the COVID-19 pandemic. To assist with increasing the response rate, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to share survey information with the populace and continue to collaborative efforts with the district offices.   
  
The VIDE/SOSE further analyzed the child count data for the respective school year and the survey respondent data by race/ethnicity to determine percent of respondent parents as an analysis for representativeness of respondent parents. This analysis revealed the following for parents with children with disabilities receiving Special Education services in the children in the respective racial/ethnic categories: For Black African American the response rate was 40.64%, from a 75.82 (+35.18%) of Black/African of children with disabilities. Next, the response rate for Hispanic/Latinos was 33.78% from a 20.73% (+13.05%) of children with disabilities. For two or more races the response rate was 53.85% represented from a 1.21% children with disabilities in two or more races (-52.63%). White (not Hispanic) children accounted for 27.27% response rate out of 2.05% (-25.22) of White (not Hispanic) children with disabilities. For Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander children yielded a 100% response rate out of 0.09% (-99.90%) percent of children with disabilities. Although Asian children with disabilities account for 0.93% of children receiving services there was no response from that racial/ethnic category. Lastly, for FFY 2020 there were no American Indian or Alaska Native children receiving special education and related services. In conclusion, for FFY 2020 the percent of respondent parents in two or more races and White is representative of this segment of the population of parents whose children receive Special Education services. The VIDE/SOSE will focus its efforts on increasing the percentage of parents’ respondents in the race/ethnicity categories of Blacks and Hispanics to increase the percent of parent responders. Overall, the total number respondents of parents with children receiving Special Education services is a representation of the population of parents in the U.S. Virgin Islands whose children receive Special Education Services. Additionally, There was a decrease of 10.39% when compared to FFY 2019 for the percentage of respondent parents for this indicator.

| **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 |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**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 eight (9th) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the ECC to perform the FFY 2020, 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. For these reasons, 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, production, 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.   
  
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, to the examination of the ordinal scores, ECC uses 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 VIDE/SOSE prepares the territorial media notifications and submits them to the Virgin Islands Department of Education, Office of Public Relations for final editing and media publishing. Furthermore, parents/guardians, Virgin Islands Advisory Panel on Special Education (VIAPSE), and other internal and external stakeholder groups are encouraged to attend. This segment of the public hearing provides parents/guardians and other stakeholders with the opportunity to establish or strengthen collaborative relationships, and most notably personnel from the University of the Virgin Islands relative to post-secondary educational needs and opportunities for children and youth with disabilities (CWD).

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
Virgin Islands reported that its response rate is 100%, however, in its narrative, it reports that "[t]he lower response rate for FFY 2020 can be attributed to the fact there was an increase in disconnected telephone numbers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine the Virgin Islands FFY 2020 response rate.   
  
Virgin Islands did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required.

## 8 - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not report the response rate or the metric used to determine representativeness. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Virgin Islands must report the information, as required by the Measurement Table.

# 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 the reporting year, 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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., non-disabled 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  
  
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,2004)). 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 (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) via the EDFacts online electronic reporting system Public school Student enrollment data from the division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) captured on September 30, 2020 and special education data captured on the December 1, 2020 for the annual Child Count along with the approved mythology were used in determining whether or not the St. Thomas-  
St. John District was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. The methodology for determining disproportionate representation is outlined in the SPP/APR.

**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.**

District 1 (St, Thomas/St. John). Utilizing the data in the charts, the State has determined that the St. Thomas-St. John District meets the minimum “n” of 10 children with disabilities receiving special education and related services for Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino children Although the St. Thomas-St. John District met the minimum n size for the racial/ethnic group of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino children. However, based on the calculations using the approved methodology, the St. Thomas-St. John district did not exceed the +20% threshold resulting in a relative difference in any racial/ethnic category, specifically Black/African American or Hispanic/Latino students. Thus, the St. Thomas-St. John district was not required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis for Indicator B9.  
  
District 2 (St. Croix). The St. Croix district meets the minimum “n” of 10 children with disabilities receiving special education and related services for Two or More Races (Multi-Race) and White children. Based on the calculation for determining disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that may be the result of inappropriate identification, the St. Croix district exceeded the 20% threshold for Two or More Races (Multi-Race) and White children. Thus, the St. Croix district was required to complete the Facilitate Self-Analysis (FSA) that addresses the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referral for Evaluation; Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards. Subsequently, the State reviewed the St. Croix District’s responses on the FSA and determined that the District is compliant with IDEA relative to policies, practices, and procedures in each of the areas addressed.  
  
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 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2005; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, Virgin Islands must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

## 9 - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data, as required due to a change in the Measurement Table. Virgin Islands must revise its baseline, using FFY 2020 data, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# 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 2020, 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 specific disability categories 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 2004). 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 the division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE), captured on September 30, 2020, and special education data captured on the December 1, 2020 for the annual Child Count along with the approved mythology 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.**

District 1 - St. Thomas/St. John  
Using the criteria above, the St. Thomas-St. John District (District 1) had at least the minimum “n” of ten (10) African American/Black children in five (5) of the six (6) disability categories and at least the minimum “n” of ten (10) Hispanic/Latino children 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. Although the St. Thomas-St. John District did not have over representation, there was disproportionality resulting in Under Representation for Hispanic/Latino children in the Disability Category of Specific Learning Disability .  
  
District 2 (St. Croix)  
Using the approved methodology referenced earlier, the St. Croix District had at least the minimum “n” of ten (10) African American/Black children in four (4) of the six (6) disability categories; Hispanic/Latino children had at least the minimum “n” of 10 in four r (4) of the disability categories, and Two or More races (Multi) had at least the minimum “n” ten (10) in one (1) 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 and Hispanic/Latino, exceeded the 20% threshold and found to have Over Representation of 1079.8701 for Two or More (Multi-Race) in the disability category of Specific Learning Disabilities, and 37.4663% in the disability category of Intellectual Learning Disabilities for Hispanic Latino children.   
  
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 for Two or More Races (Multi Race) and Intellectual Learning Disabilities for Hispanic Latino children. 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 2021. 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 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2005; however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, Virgin Islands must revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data.

## 10 - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data, as required due to a change in the Measurement Table. Virgin Islands must revise its baseline, using FFY 2020 data, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 1.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 63 | 57 | 100.00% | 100% | 90.48% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

Based on the desk audit conducted in FFY 2020 in District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) and the missing electronic records of six (6) children referred for evaluation, the State was unable to determine the District's level of compliance regarding parental consent to evaluate and completion of the evaluation within the state-establised timeline of 45 days.

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

6

**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.**

The absence of the six (6) children included in (a) that are not included in (b) are not due to the evaluation not being completed on time. The non-inclusion of those children in the overall total are due to the State not being able to verify District 1 (St. Thomas) level of compliance due to the missing electronic records.

**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, 2020, thru June 30, 2021, desk audits were conducted to verify if the data received from the district for all sixty-three students (63) 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 2020 (reporting period of July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2021, a total of sixty-three students (63) were referred for initial evaluation. However, of the 63 children referred, twelve (12) adopted the Individualized Family Service plan (IFSP); three (3) were found not eligible for special education services; and three (3) were withdrawals as follows: (1-referral withdrawn; 1 consent for evaluation withdrawn; 1 parent withdrawn, no explanation),   
  
Additionally, in District One, six (6) student electronic records could not be located in the Student Data Management System (Goalview), thus, the data received on the Data Report I.A-1: Initial Evaluation could not be verified. Aside from the missing electronic records of the six (6) students in District 1, the desk audit results verified that the Districts have made much improvement in 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 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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

Because Virgin Islands reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, Virgin Islands must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Virgin Islands must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Virgin Islands must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: 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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 60.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 70.97% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 45 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 4 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 40 |
| 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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. | 40 | 41 | 100.00% | 100% | 97.56% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The reason for slippage was due to the late implementation date for one (1) child. Although the services started nine (9) days after the third birthday the IEP developed prior to age three (3). Services commenced nine (9) days after their third birthday.

**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**

1

**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.**

For FFY 2020, there were an additional eight (8) children not “a” are in b, c, d, or e. who were provided services in Part C and referred to Part B prior to their 3rd birthdays; the breakdown for the additional eight (8) children are as follows: (a) four (4) children files were closed by Part C programs which were due to the inability to contact the parent, (b) two (2) those children’s parents refused Part B services, and (c) two (2) children/family moved out of the territory.

**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 a parent.   
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The following is the data source for this indicator (a) the State Monitoring system, (b) State Student Management System (“Goal View”), and (c) State database that house all data for the respective reporting year FFY 2020 (e.g., children born between July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2018). For FFY 2020, during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the VIDE/SOSE continued to provide ongoing technical assistance to each district. This technical assistance ensures that each LEAs remain compliant with this indicator. More specifically, those children receiving services under the Part C program and referred to Part B for eligibility determination experienced a smooth and timely transition to the Part B program.

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

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input relative to performance and targets the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (8, 11, and 12) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children, preschool and early childhood early learning experts, regular and special education early childhood and elementary school personnel, school counselors, school administrators, district directors and coordinators, educational diagnostic team members, and outside and partner linking agencies.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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

Because Virgin Islands reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, Virgin Islands must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Virgin Islands must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Virgin Islands must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 312 | 312 | 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 2020, 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 form July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021. The VIDE/SOSE then reviewed through desk audit, the IEPS of each student listed on the spreadsheet using the National Technical Assistance Center (NTACT/C) 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 2020, 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 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 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:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

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

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

**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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**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 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. States should consider categories such as race/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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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 must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 23.50% | 24.00% | 24.00% | 25.00% | 25.00% |
| A | 19.00% | Data | 25.97% | 24.14% | 23.53% | 26.15% | 25.49% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 60.50% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 62.00% | 62.00% |
| B | 59.00% | Data | 68.83% | 68.97% | 73.53% | 72.31% | 76.47% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 81.00% | 81.50% | 81.50% | 82.00% | 83.00% |
| C | 80.00% | Data | 83.12% | 82.76% | 82.35% | 83.08% | 90.20% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 19.00% | 19.50% | 20.00% | 20.50% | 21.00% | 21.50% |
| Target B >= | 65.00% | 66.00% | 66.50% | 67.00% | 67.50% | 68.00% |
| Target C >= | 73.00% | 75.50% | 77.00% | 78.50% | 80.00% | 80.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2020, VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on indicator clusters to ensure expert representation in all target areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of students with disabilities, grade level and content experts in secondary transition personnel, regular and special education personnel, district directors, coordinators, supervisors, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic team members, private business sector, interagency partners, and other outside and linking agencies. The VIDE/SOSE divided the new stakeholders into cluster groups. Members were presented with indicator background and current information as well as data. Stakeholders were tasked with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance, ensuring quality services, and measuring outcomes for CWD.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the targets for Measurement C and make recommendations for revision that will demonstrate improvement over the 5 year targets from 2020-2025 for this indicator. The Transition Clusters Stakeholder Group newly revised target for this measurement demonstrate improvement over the 2009 Baseline data as required.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 108 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 41 |
| Response Rate | 37.96% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 8 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 19 |
| 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) | 3 |
| 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 8 | 41 | 25.49% | 19.00% | 19.51% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 27 | 41 | 76.47% | 65.00% | 65.85% | 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) | 30 | 41 | 90.20% | 73.00% | 73.17% | 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.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Response Rate | 51.00% | 37.96% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

In FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE obtained demographic information (students’, parent/guardians’ name and contact information, telephone numbers for students and their parents/guardians, 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 2021, one (1) year after students left school, the SOSE 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. For the purpose of increasing the response rate year over year, the SOSE will email surveys and conduct telephonic interviews to complete any responses not received by mail.   
To improve the response rate over year, the SOSE will work closely with the LEA to ensure that demographic information such as mailing and email addresses and telephone numbers for parents and or guardians are recorded accurately specifically to augment with additional contact information such as parents/students work telephone numbers and or other relatives mailing addresses which will in turn result in reducing the numbers of surveys returned due to wrong mailing addresses and lower response rate due to wrong and or inoperable telephone numbers. The SOSE will encourage LEAs to collect in the students senior year of high school their email addresses thus increasing through a wider array of demographic data, such as, telephone and email addresses the students contact information and increase the rate of responders from all group of exiters.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The VIDE/SOSE mailed 108 surveys in June of 2021 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 41 out of the 108 leavers for a 36.94% 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.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE analysis of its response rate through the use of its PSO calculator was able to capture the underrepresentation of non-responders and specifically noted that some disability categories had +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders (see the metric used to determine representativeness). The VIDE/SOSE underrepresentation by students in the ID and DO were attributed to demographic information mainly, incorrect or invalid telephone numbers, outdated or incomplete mailing addresses, and outdated exiters profile. The VIDE/SOSE will introduce and capture through its monthly exiters report the most current student address and telephone numbers in order to capture the data for its post school outcomes surveys. The VIDE/SOSE will prescribe a number of attempts that must be made before the student, parent or guardian is considered a “non-responder.” No less than ten (10) attempts will be made on various days and at different times, before a student, parent or guardian are considered “non-responder.” Telephone calls will be made in this way to maximize the chances of reaching students, parents and guardians whose mailed surveys were not collected. This will ensure all students, parents or guardian may participate in the State's post school outcomes surveys, which will eliminate any chance of nonresponse biases at either their residences or places of business.

**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.**

The VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis using the State PSO calculator on gender, graduation/exiting status, race/ethnicity and disability category of the 41 responders. The SOSE item analysis for all responders produced valuable data and display counts and representativeness for subgroup in each demographic category. For instance, the percentages of the responder were as follows; from the 41 responders 28 were in the SLD category for a respondent representation of 68.29%. 43.75% of the SLD demographic responded from a 59.26% target leaver representation. 13 of the responders were among the 5 disability categories ranging from Autism, Emotional Behavior Disorder, Intellectual Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury and other Health Impairments for a respondent demographic of 31.71% from a 40.74% target leaver representation; 35.71% of respondents were female; 78.05% responders were in the minority/ethnicity category (not white/non-Hispanic); 22% of the responders out of 28.13% from the drop out target leaver representation responded to the survey.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the targets for Measurement C and make recommendations for revision of targets that will demonstrate improvement over the 5 year targets from 2020-2025 for this indicator. The newly revised target for this measurement demonstrate improvement over the 2009 Baseline data as required.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The VIDE/SOSE PSO Calculator described the response rate by representativeness of responders according to disability category for each subgroups item analyses. The overall total of exiters were 108 of which the SOSE collected data for 41 responders. In the SLD disability category the response rate by representativeness was 68.29% from a 59.26% target leavers representation for a difference of +9.03%. The response rate by representativeness for ED was 4.63% from a 7.23% target leavers representativeness for a 2.69% which is less than the difference of +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target leavers. The response rate by representativeness for ID was 4.88% from a 12.96% target leavers representativeness for an underrepresentation of 8.1%. The response rate by representativeness of all other responders among the other disability categories was 19.51% from a 23.15% of the categories of target leavers representativeness for an underrepresentation of 3.64%. For the DO the response rate representativeness was 21.95% from a 29.63% target leavers representativeness for an underrepresentation of 7.68%. The SOSE will continue to work closely with its Transition Cluster Indicators (Indicators 1,2,13,14) Stakeholders' group (namely the LEAs) to build capacity for implementing practices that will promote response from a robust response and higher response rate of youth who are no longer in secondary schools and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school thus reduce any discrepancy of underrepresentation of the target leavers representativeness.

| **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 |

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

During FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE has continued to work closely with the LEA 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

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
Virgin Islands did not analyze the response rate to identify potential non-response bias, as required by the Measurement Table.   
  
Virgin Islands reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, Virgin Islands reported disability categories that were over and underrepresented. Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative. OSEP notes that the State did describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

## 14 - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not analyze the response rate to identify potential non-response bias. Virgin Islands must report the required information in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State also must report whether the FFY 2021 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, and, if not, the actions Virgin Islands is taking to address this issue. Virgin Islands must also include its 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.

# 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**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 and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 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**

Although there were less than ten(10) resolutions and the VIDE/SOSE was not required to report on this indicator, stakeholders' input was still solicited relative to the requirements of this indicator. This was conducted through the VIDE/SOSE's expanded and reconfigured stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on the elements of the Dispute resolution systems. The composition of stakeholder members includes but is not limited to: parents of children with disabilities, grade level, and content experts, regular and special education school personnel, school administrators, district directors and coordinators, educational diagnostic team members. For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE's newly redesigned stakeholder group members were provided with indicator background and current information relative to IDEA and procedural safeguards.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2008 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data | 100.00% |  |  | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 0.00% |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 100.00% | 0.00% |  | 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

Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020. 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) 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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 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**

Although there were less than ten (10) mediation sessions and the VIDE/SOSE was not required to report on this indicator, stakeholders' input was still solicited relative to the requirements of this indicator. This was conducted through the VIDE/SOSE's expanded and reconfigured stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on the elements of the Dispute resolution systems. The composition of stakeholder members includes but is not limited to: parents of children with disabilities, grade level, and content experts, regular and special education school personnel, school administrators, district directors and coordinators, educational diagnostic team members. For FFY 2020, the VIDE/SOSE's newly redesigned stakeholder group members were provided with indicator background and current information relative to IDEA and procedural safeguards.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 81.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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

Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. Virgin Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

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

The Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE), State Office of Special Education’s (SOSE) State Identified Measurable Results (SiMR), is to increase the percentage of third-grade children with disabilities who score proficient or above on state-wide reading and language assessments.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE has attached the Theory of Action (TOA) it can also be accessed on the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s homepage web portal www.vide.vi homepage by first clicking the "Our Divisions" tab, then clicking on Special Education.

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

YES

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

The VIDE/SOSE requested and received a waiver in accordance with section 8401(b) of the (ESEA), as amended., for a 2nd consecutive year due to the Covid-19 Pandemic, no Statewide Summative Assessments were administered which resulted in the inability to determine how any modification to the SSIP evaluation will impact the implementation for modifying the SSIP. The VIDE/SOSE will continue to engage its evaluation matrixes as its designed to improve, over the year of the SSIP/SiMR.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

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

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2014-15 | 8.61% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 53.50% | 53.50% | 53.50% | 53.75% | 53.75% | 54.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **0** |  | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
|  |  |  | 53.50% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

The State Office of Curriculum and Instruction and Planning Research Evaluation are the main data sources for the State's Statewide Assessment thus, for the FFY 2020 (the school year 2020-21), the VIDE/SOSE collects data on Statewide Assessment through the required reporting format EdFact (file spec 175,178 and185 data group 583, 584 and 588). However as a result of the Centers for Disease Control Prevention(CDC) and Virgin Islands Department of Health (VIDOH) national emergency guidelines relating to the COVID-19 Pandemic National Emergency, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) requested a waiver; according to section 8401(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. As such, Assessments were only administered only for informational purposes.  
  
VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP Response:  
  
The VIDE/SOSE will utilize the statewide assessment data for this indicator.   
  
For the numerator the VIDE/SOSE will utilize the proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards), in Reading.   
  
For the denominator the VIDE/SOSE will divided the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)], in Reading.

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

The VIDE will use the Transition Matrix growth model under the VIDE Elementary Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Accountability System. However, the revised accountability system has not been implemented due to learning interruptions caused by Hurricanes Irma and Maria and the COVID-19 pandemic. The VIDE expects to finalize the VIDE Accountability System by December 2022.   
  
Transition Matrix description: This method tracks students’ growth at the performance standard level. The VIDE transition matrix has eight performance levels for a given year as rows and the performance levels for a later year as columns, which is broken down into a point system. These points range from zero (0) to two hundred (200).

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

NO

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

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

As noted in the Year 5 of reporting of the VIDE/SOSE’s SSIP, challenges remain particularly with the ongoing stakeholders (internal and external) conversations; relating to the analysis and use of other data points (qualitative and quantitative). The use of various data points will assist with identifying strengths, challenges, and progress relative to the Coherent Improvement Strategies (CIS). Moreover, continued collaboration and data conversations amongst core internal stakeholder members will aid with immediately identifying areas for technical assistance and professional development. These steps are critical in gauging the effectiveness of; professional development activities, use of evidence-based instructional academic and behavioral strategies, and improving student achievement. For these reasons, the VIDE/SOSE recognizes there was a need to reconfigure its stakeholder group. As such, the VIDE/SOSE recruited new and tenured members to the newly designed cluster groups which are based on each member’s level of expertise. This new configuration also included parents of children with disabilities. As mentioned in previous reporting years, there is an essential need for the development and vetted Territorial/District-wide Response to Instruction (RtI) Manual, progress monitoring calendar, and collaboration amongst District Offices of Curriculum and Instruction. The primary focus of this collaboration will be to intensify the use of data to support the selection and scaling-up of evidence-based professional development classroom strategies premised on evidence-based academic and behavioral practices, with the goal that all children specifically children with disabilities receive high-quality instruction.

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

YES

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

1.The impact on data completeness: The VIDE/SOSE mechanism for data collection that informs the progress of implementation of the SSIP data points particularly the implementation of the coherent improvement strategies of the MTSS-RtI and PBIS, and the steps and alignment needed to achieve the State's SiMR were impacted specifically by COVID-19. The State's Office of Curriculum and Instruction and Planning Research Evaluation continued to collect data for informational purpose to gauge the level of student proficiency and scaling-up capacity to support the State's CIS.   
2. Explanation of State's ability to collect data: During the 2020-21 school year the VIDE remained on a virtual instructional model, thus, the VIDE/SOSE was unable to collect implementation and SiMR data due to guidelines imposed for mitigating infections and limitations of in-person instruction. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the VIDE/SOSE's ability to administer statewide assessment thus affecting its ability to collect data for this indicator. Like other public agency, the Virgin Islands Department of Education adhered to the Virgin Islands Department of Health’s, Safety and Health Guidelines relating to the COVID-19, pandemic.  
3. Step(s) to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection: Based on the results of the State's administration of the Smarter Balanced for informational purposes in the Spring of 2021, the impact of COVID-19 data collection, informed the districts on the use of assessment data for tier II and III interventions. The State will work intensely and purposefully with the district curriculum and instruction director, data and assessment director, as well as the personnel of planning research evaluation to create a data platform for readily disseminating data as well as evaluating data points such as proficiency rate of children with disabilities in grades 3.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

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

As required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A) the VIDE/SOSE’s public reporting of the current evaluation plan for the State's (VIDE/SOSEs) can be accessed on the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s homepage web portal www.vide.vi homepage by first clicking the "Our Divisions" tab, then clicking on Special Education.

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

NO

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

For Year 6 reporting (SY 2020-21), the VIDE continued a virtual instructional model as such the implementation of improvement strategies was limited, namely to the pilot school teams as outlined in the SSIP, RtI, and PBIS Logic Models. However, the VIDE/SOSE was able to provide some levels of professional development opportunities for administrators, special and regular education teachers, school counselors, special education chairpersons, and paraprofessionals. The professional development topics are as follows: evidence-based instructional strategies to promote student performance in English language arts, a service delivery model to meet the needs of students with disabilities in MTSS in a virtual, hybrid, and in-person learning environments, and meeting the provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

As noted previously, for Year 6 reporting (SY 2020-21), the implementation of improvement strategies was limited; as such, the VIDE/SOSE experienced challenges with levels of evaluation; namely the short-term outcomes as it relates to professional development, collection, and achievement of SiMR data. However, the VIDE/SOSE utilized baseline and trend data; to communicate with its stakeholder member on performance and the required achievement levels. Trend data included but were not limited to LRE data and the revised statewide assessment data collection and reporting requirements.   
  
Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to engage with other VIDE divisions to maintain the connection of the state systemic and continuous improvement of its SSIP that will positively facilitate how the assessment components will be implemented and evaluated throughout the years. The VIDE/SOSE will continue to build on the four strands outlined in its Theory of Action (TOA) by leveraging the guidance provided by the national resource partners and through its affiliation with the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (USDOE, OSEP) that will result in achieving the State’s SSIP priorities and SiMR.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

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

As noted in Year 5 reporting, challenges remain with the levels of implementation and achievement to the VIDE’s infrastructure, ultimately resulting in limited attainment of the improvement strategies in the VIDE/SOSE’s SSIP. The next steps for VIDE/SOSE are as follows: assess the needs of the pilot schools in Districts and 1 and 2, identify the status of each pilot school infrastructure, specifically all school personnel and students, continue with each improvement strategy with the VIDE/SOSE’s RtI, and PBIS logic models that will support the achievement of short and long term outcomes more specifically, VIDE/SOSE’s SiMR. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to explore, and when necessary, procure professional services that align with its coherent improvement strategies. Furthermore, services will assist with high levels of professional development premised on evidence-based educational and behavioral strategies that will help increase teacher knowledge and skills relative to the implementation of MTSS with high levels of fidelity. Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to collaborate with the Broad Indicator Cluster stakeholder group mechanisms to introduce/reintroduce its Logic Models (LM); to novice and tenured CORE stakeholders. This step will allow the VIDE/SOSE the opportunity to review and align the coherent improvement strategies contained within the LM models, which will assist the VIDE/SOSE in the processing areas; reconnecting. The VIDE/SOSE will reiterate the following next steps; revisit roles (district and school), namely SSIP and pilot schools, collaborate with district's superintendents to identify a liaison, engage in dialogue with state and district leaders to solicit CORE SSIP broad stakeholder committee members, identify and collaborate teams’ roles; and secure and procure contractual services to provide the high levels of evidence-based instructional strategies. More specifically, VIDE/SOSE will continue its use of Table D, included in its Year 4 reporting submitted April 1, 2020, as the primary mechanism to assist with all-inclusive planning and execution of Professional Development activities as well as data collection and analysis.

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

During Year 6 reporting (SY 2020-21), the VIDE continued a virtual instructional model; as such, the VIDE/SOSE was unable to garner data to measure the level of evidence-based practices implemented during this period. This was due to the limited ability to observe classroom strategies. However, the VIDE/SOSE will work closely with those pilot schools to ascertain the level of data collection and identify the types of data elements necessary to ensure appropriate use and implementation of reinforcement behavioral strategies/systems, a feature of the PBIS system. This specific strategy will allow classroom teachers to identify and provide the appropriate academic and behavioral support to students, more importantly, achieve the desired targeted positive behavior. In addition, these reinforcement systems will aid teachers and other school personnel with reducing the frequency of challenging student behavior, eventually increasing instructional time and meaningful teacher and student engagement.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

Evidence-Based Practices and Professional Developments were on-going during the virtual platform, the VIDE/SOSE utilized all available opportunities to continue its collaborative and targeted efforts in scaling-up and supporting the transformative components of the virtual classroom as such, the VIDE/SOSE was able to provide some levels of professional development opportunities for administrators, special and regular education teachers, school counselors, special education chairpersons, and paraprofessionals. The professional development topics are as follows: evidence-based instructional strategies to promote student performance in English language arts, a service delivery model to meet the needs of students with disabilities in MTSS in a virtual, hybrid, and in-person learning environments, and meeting the provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

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

The VIDE/SOSE continued its on-going efforts during Year 5 of implementation to facilitate professional development premised on the use of MTSS-RtI and PBIS to all teachers, administrators and counselors. Presentations from the Parental Satisfaction Survey were also provided during this SSIP implementation year to parents of students with disabilities as well as broad stakeholders. These activities like in previous SSIP reporting were supported through the securing and providing of consultative services process. All presentations were conducted virtually. The VIDE/SOSE is confident that these on-going practices, activities, and strategies that impacts the SiMR will produce the desired outcomes of improving reading performance for all students including students with disabilities in the third grade.

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

As previously described, the VIDE/SOSE recognizes that meaningful and intentional collaboration and ongoing planning is essential to the implementation of existing practices. The monitoring of implementation of evidenced-base practices with fidelity is a measure that is supported through the State's CIFRMS. The broader measurable outcomes for implementing the use of MTSS-RtI and PBIS practices requires the observable effectual use of RtI practices; the streamline of professional development activities to allow full application and visual evidence of implementation; including school level activities such as walkthroughs and classroom observations to gauge implementation. The VIDE/SOSE have continued through its levels of monitoring with fidelity the impact of its virtual professional development and is prepared to assess the changes in instructional practices in a more personal level as permitted through in-person learning.

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

As noted, previously in this document, the VIDE/SOSE secured i-Ready student data for Year 6 (SY 2020-21); of implementation. This additional data was provided by the District Office of Data and Assessment for children with disabilities in the four (4) pilot schools. The results of this data are presented in the section “Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR”, undoubtedly denotes the need to continue activities premised on increasing teacher, school base personnel, school data teams, and parents on various use of evidence-based instructional practices that will assist with improving performance on classroom and statewide assessments of children with disabilities.

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

For the next reporting period, the VIDE/SOSE continues to use its Theory of Action (TOA) and Logic Models (LMs) to guide the selection, implementation, and evaluation of the degree of attainment of the State Identified Measurable Results (SiMR). The TOA includes four strands (e.g. leadership, collaboration, technical assistance, and accountability) is designed to supports the districts and pilot schools to improve students with disabilities’ performance on the 3rd-grade literacy assessment. See Year 4 reporting of the VIDE/SOSE’s SSIP.   
  
Although the VIDE/SOSE secured i-Ready data for Year 6 (SY 2020-21) reporting, this data only included two data sets for District 1 and one data set for District 2. Additionally, existing challenges are evident, particularly with the ongoing stakeholder (internal and external) conversations; relating to the analysis and use of other data points (qualitative and quantitative) that will assist with identifying the following: strengths, challenges, and progress relative to the Coherent Improvement Strategies. These steps are critical in gauging the effectiveness of; professional development activities, use of evidence-based instructional academic and behavioral strategies, and improving student achievement. For these reasons, the VIDE/SOSE recognizes that it must identify action steps that will expeditiously identify areas of students, teacher, and school professional development needs for administrators and school teams at each pilot school. Moreover, there remains a need to restructure existing communication and meeting calendars to facilitate ongoing discussion between district leadership, school leadership, and school data (improvement) teams. As mentioned, in Year 4 reporting, there is an essential need for the development and vetted Territory/District-wide Response to Instruction (RtI) Manual, progress monitoring calendar, and collaboration amongst District Offices of Curriculum and Instruction to intensify the use of data to support the selection and scaling-up of evidence-based professional development classroom strategies.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

To garner comprehensive stakeholder input the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder component with a concentrated focus on Indicator clusters (3,5 and SSIP) to ensure representativeness in all areas. This reconfiguration includes but is not limited to the following: parents of children with disabilities, grade level and content experts (state and district assessment personnel), school administrators, early childhood personnel, district directors, and coordinators.

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

The COVID-19 pandemic presented a tremendous amount of challenges for students, teachers, and stakeholders at large. During Phase III Year 6 implementation of the SSIP, the VIDE/SOSE continued to inform its internal stakeholders of its ongoing progress of the SSIP; through various mechanisms such as its newly configured Broad Indicator Cluster stakeholder groups. The primary goal of the newly configured stakeholder groups is to provide input and feedback, more importantly, to continuously evaluate the ongoing implementation of the strategies within its SSIP. Furthermore, the concluding goal of the VIDE/SOSE is to build the capacity of educators to meet the educational and behavioral needs of all children, particularly those of children with attaining improved academic performance explicitly achieving the VIDE/SOSE's SiMR.

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

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

As reported for Year 5 of the VIDE/SOSE’s SSIP stakeholders remained steadfast with expressing this specific concern relating to the navigating and selecting relevant electronic information and flexibility and availability of PD activities. For these reasons, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to explore the facilitation of relevant professional development activities, continue to promote higher levels of stakeholder engagement, through its Broad Indicator Cluster stakeholder groups meetings, to select and determine the most effective manner/professional development opportunities to address areas such as; data-based decisions, cultural responsiveness, and core instructional programs that are aligned to the coherent improvement strategies ultimately improving performance for the VIDE/SOSE’s SiMR.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

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

The VIDE/SOSE has no newly described activities to be implemented for the upcoming fiscal year. Consequently, the VIDE/SOSE will continue with the activities included in Table D, included in its Year 4 reporting submitted April 1, 2020.

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

There are no new activities listed above.

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

As reported in Year 5 reporting and throughout this SSIP, the VIDE/SOSE anticipates that barriers related to sustainability will continue to be a challenge. Notwithstanding the need to intensify collaboration, the VIDE/SOSE will be proactive in developing a plan with the Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Curriculum and Instruction, District Office of Superintendents to continue its quest of promoting and improving instructional practices that will improve the use of the MTSS-RtI and PBIS essential components (universal screening, progress monitoring, multi-leveled prevention system, and data-based decision making). The VIDE/SOSE is confident that this partnership will yield positive academic and behavioral outcomes for all students, particularly students with disabilities.   
  
Steps: To work intentionally with the State's and District's leadership(Broad Indicator Cluster Stakeholders): Work with Deputy Commissioner of Curriculum and Instructions and Districts Insular Superintendents to leverage technical assistance opportunities and resources to improve the collection of implementation of best practices and to continue gauging the provisions of quality instruction by providing high-intense professional development evidence-based practices that will assist with increasing the knowledge and skills level on the implementation with the fidelity of the MTSS-RtI and PBIS models.

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

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, Virgin Islands did not report any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.   
  
Virgin Islands provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the Virgin Islands has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

## 17 - Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 17 attachment(s) included in Virgin Islands FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, 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.

# 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, Ph.D.

**Title:**

Deputy Commissioner of Curriculum and Instruction/State Director of Special Education

**Email:**

renee.charleswell@vide.vi

**Phone:**

(340) 774-0100, ext. 8801

**Submitted on:**

04/27/22 3:13:33 PM

# ED Attachments

  

1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)