

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B
for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education
Act

For reporting on
FFY 2022

US Virgin Islands



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Virgin Islands Department of Education (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. Hence, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE)/State Office of Special Education (SOSE) developed its general supervision system, consisting of eight components, as 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEIA). As noted in the VIDE/SOSE's State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) submitted in February 2022 (FFY2020), the VIDE is continuing to experience infrastructural challenges of the COVID-19 global pandemic, which impacted the delivery of academic instructions for FFY 2021 (2021-22 school year) for students with and without disabilities.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The VIDE/SOSE has developed a comprehensive data system that enables the Territory to collect, analyze, and report timely, valid, and reliable Section 616 and Section 618 data as required by the IDEIA. The State's Part B Data Manager 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 and provide the necessary data clarifications and updates on revisions/changes to reporting requirements of all 618 and 619 data.

The VIDE/SOSE utilizes a web-based data management system to manage the functions of the Part B program. This system is designed to ensure that the collected data is timely, accurate, valid, and reliable. More importantly, the VIDE/SOSE follows the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs and Services (OSEP), and IDEA federal regulations. In the School Year 2021-2022 (FFY 2021), the VIDE/SOSE commenced with the preparation for the conversion of the data management system to an improved online web-based special education student data management system ("EDPlan") to ensure that all revisions and upgrades complied with the requirements of the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). During this conversion, the VIDE/SOSE met weekly with the vendors of EDPlan and discussed questions, concerns, and status updates. The VIDE/SOSE hosted multiple virtual and onsite training in each LEA for all State Office of Special Education personnel, administrators, special education teachers, school social workers, psychologists, physical, occupational, and speech and language therapists, and paraprofessionals to ensure proper use and understanding of the system's features. Moreover, the SOSE worked directly with the vendor to provide "real-time" assistance to users.

Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to work closely with each LEA and other special education personnel to garner input relative to system refinements. Further, all revisions and upgrades to the newly introduced EDPlan system are ongoing. They will continue to be followed by Intensive training and technical assistance regarding using EDPlan for VIDE/SOSE and LEA personnel. This web-based system ("EDPlan") has numerous business rules with corresponding built-in edit checks, promoting high data quality levels. Additionally, this newly adapted system produces all system-specific special education documents in the native language of parents/guardians and students, data for required public reporting, and, more specifically, its ability to serve as a primary data source for all monitoring activities. Each year, the VIDE/SOSE personnel conducts on-site monitoring visits in each LEAs for previous FFYs to verify that data in the EDPlan is consistent with the information contained in the students' IEPs and other associated records. However, in FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), VIDE/SOSE personnel utilized EDPlan to conduct this monitoring event. 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 SIS serves as the VIDE primary collection tool for various 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, 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 the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

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 the implementation of the IDEIA over time. Currently, it includes seventeen (17) indicators that provide a measurable indication of the VIDE's performance in specific legal priority areas under Part B. Some 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 which was submitted online 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 Plan was a new indicator in FFY 2013 which was developed in phases with accompanying implementation years. Until FFY 2019, the SSIP was reported annually in April however, beginning in FFY 2019 (School Year 2019/20) Phase IV Year 6 implementation the submission was changed to February 1st in line with its APR.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The VIDE/SOSE continue to provide differentiated technical assistance to each LEA to support them in achieving and maintaining the regulatory requirements of IDEA. This technical assistance aims to assist them in implementing programs, practices, and instructional strategies that lead to improved outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. IDEA program Information and technical assistance are shared through the following formats: email, virtual and face-to-face meetings, and conference calls.

The VIDE/SOSE provides general technical assistance (GTA) to district and school administrators, special education and general education teachers and paraprofessionals, and other educational personnel in both LEAs on research-based topics that impact the provision of special education and related services. These (GTA) include, but are not limited to VIDE/SOSE's updated special education management system (EDPlan), local budget applications, and areas for improvement of specific compliance and results Indicators within the VIDE/SOSE's APR/SSIP and/or other areas of concern derived from qualitative or quantitative data.

Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) is based on the VIDE/SOSE use of LEA performance and compliance 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 non-compliance. Both LEAs have and continue to receive targeted TTA related to meeting the secondary transition requirements reported in Indicators 4, 9, 10, 12, and 13 of the SPP/APR. LEAs are also 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.

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.

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 Pandemic, most professional learning occurred on-site through face-to-face professional development sessions. During the 2022-2023 school year, personnel at both the State and District level attended in-person and virtual training as follows: (a) the 2023 Interactive Institute ii23 in Charlotte, North Carolina; (b) CADRE's 9th National Symposium on Due Process Procedures, October 2023, Denver, Colorado; (c) CADRE's online SEA Dispute Resolution Learning Community (May 2023) which focused on the emergence of new dispute resolution matters proposed by OSEP.

The District Office of Special Education, territory-wide 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 several schools which 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 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.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

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

YES

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.

Since the inception of the VIDE/BOSE's SPP/APR and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the VIDE/BOSE's 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 continue to be expanded. Thus, broadening 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 who receive special services and related services, is the impetus for the development of the newly revised broad indicator cluster stakeholders group.

As reported in prior years' SPP/APR submission, (e.g. FFY 2019, 2020, 2021 (School Years 2019/20, 2020/21) and 2021/22) parent stakeholder members are part of the State's broad stakeholder groups. Additionally, the general public was 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 the various mechanisms the VIDE/BOSE utilizes to inform its stakeholders of the progress and outcomes of the delivery of services for children and youth with disabilities. The presentation offers the general public, parents/guardians, and broad stakeholder groups data and analysis of approximately seventy (70) items that are classified into ten (10) groups or sub-scales, 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 2020 CIRFMS. The data collected during this phase of the general supervision process provided stakeholders with valuable information on performance and outcomes data. Moreover, the results enabled every member of the indicator cluster groups a close-up look at how each cluster informs the delivery of services for children with disabilities

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.

Since the COVID-19 pandemic, parent engagement has decreased across all student populations. Though state and district entities have provided numerous opportunities for engagement, parents have remained reluctant to participate. However, state and district leadership have initiated various activities to increase engagement, such as neighborhood visits, community connect series, virtual town halls, and workshops that provide creative lessons and projects for advancement. These activities offer an array of opportunities for parents to meet, discuss, and provide meaningful feedback on improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Additionally, twice a year, parents have the opportunity to meet with educators, community business stakeholders, and legislators in a social setting to discuss relevant and pressing issues affecting student performance.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

The VIDE/BOSE utilizes the following mechanisms to garner public input for the aforementioned areas:

1. Annual Parental Satisfaction Survey (Public report generated and disseminated annually during a public presentation).
2. Broad Indicator Cluster Stakeholders Group:
3. Districts' Annual Determination (Report generated and disseminated in September of current school calendar)
4. District Performance Profiles (Report generated and disseminated in September of current school calendar)
5. Continuous Improvement and Results Focus Monitoring System (CIRFMS) (conducted and reported annually for corresponding FFY and school year)
6. Quarterly Broad Stakeholder Meetings (Meetings on March, June, September, and December of the current school calendar)
7. VIAPSE Meetings (Meetings on February, May, August, and November of the 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/BOSE 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-needed basis. In addition, the VIDE/BOSE will utilize its District Performance Profiles and its Annual Performance Report for each respective year to make the results of the target setting, as well as the analysis of the indicators within the APR to aid with the investigation to explore the most suitable evidence-based strategies to improve academic and functional outcomes for children and youth with disabilities and their families. Moreover, the VIDE/BOSE adapts the OSEP's timeline for public reporting.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

As required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A), the VIDE/BOSE's public reporting for FFY 2021 (School Year 2021-22) of each LEA 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 established set targets.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The Virgin Islands has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must provide the required information.

The Virgin Island's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the Virgin Island's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the Virgin Islands of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the Virgin Islands to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the Virgin Islands 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 Virgin Islands must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Virgin Islands received assistance; and (2) the actions the Virgin Islands took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Due to the Territory's determination of "needs assistance" status for both 2022 and 2023, the VIDE/SOSE received technical assistance during school year 2022-2023 from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) particularly in data collection, implementation of the SSIP, ongoing evaluation and evaluation. Additionally, state personnel attended CADRE's 9th Symposium on Due Process Procedures in addition to participating in CADRE's virtual online training on SEA Dispute Resolution Learning Community which focused on the emergence of new dispute resolution matters proposed by OSEP. SOSE personnel obtained training from the National Technical Assistance Center (NTAC) and then customized that training for district personnel. More importantly, the technical assistance provided a blueprint on the necessary supports needed to restructure the VIDE/SOSE's operational capacity on various levels.

The VIDE/SOSE continues to collaborate with the LEAs to investigate ways to improve online learning accessibility for teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators. School Improvement Teams/Data Chart teams have been established at several schools which provide an avenue for sharing information with school 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.

Intro - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands' determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023, determination letter informed the Virgin Islands that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Virgin Islands received assistance; and (2) the actions the Virgin Islands took as a result of that technical assistance. The Virgin Islands provided the required information.

The Virgin Islands are required to publicly report on the performance towards the FFY 2021 targets of each LEA, as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2021 APR. Specifically, although the Virgin Islands included a description of where, on its Web site, its FFY 2021 SPP/APR could be located, OSEP is unable to access the required information because the link provided does not work.

The Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the Virgin Islands' IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years. Those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the Department's 2024 determination.

Intro - Required Actions

The Virgin Islands has not publicly reported on the FFY 2021 (July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) performance of each LEA located in the Virgin Islands on the targets in the Virgin Islands' performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA. With its FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must provide a Web link demonstrating that the Virgin Islands reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the Virgin Islands on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2021. In addition, the Virgin Islands must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR, how and where the Virgin Islands reported to the public on the FFY 2022 performance of LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

The Virgin Islands' IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the Virgin Islands' 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the Virgin Islands of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the Virgin Islands to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the Virgin Islands 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 Virgin Islands must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Virgin Islands 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	54.63%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	41.00%	44.00%	44.50%	54.63%	55.00%
Data	53.21%	49.53%	46.99%	54.63%	60.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	55.50%	56.00%	56.50%	57.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE’s progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director’s monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational “meet and greet” workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE’s SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands’ capacity for diverse groups of parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	54
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	11
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	16

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
54	81	60.00%	55.50%	66.67%	Met target	No Slippage

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 youth to graduate with a regular high school diploma, which includes youth with disabilities, are as follows: all students must earn a minimum of 26 Carnegie Units spanning from grade nine through and concluding 12. Each student must earn twenty-one (21) of the Carnegie Units in specific required courses, delineated below, and earn the remaining five (5) Carnegie Units in elective courses. All students must achieve a 70% or better grade in each required course and elective to earn course credit (Carnegie Unit) toward graduation with a regular high school diploma. In addition, students must complete 100 community service hours to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE used the exact data 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: $54 / 81 = 66.67\%$

Based on the FFY 2022 target and performance data for this indicator, the VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded the target of 55.5% for FFY 2022, notably, an increase of 6.67% when compared with the FFY2021 performance data.

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2021-2022), the VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14 by engaging in ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners and through these channels engaging the districts' in continued collaboration and professional technical development. The professional development, coupled with ongoing monitoring of the LEAs on writing effective IEPs, ensuring provisions of coordinated related services are implemented, and rigorous reviews of State Results Driven Accountability Exiting Report (monthly exiting profiles), have all lent themselves very useful in providing the districts with the most effective practices to promote effective student-centered outcomes. In building capacity and guiding the districts, the VIDE/SOSE continues to promote 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

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

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* 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 dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (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 section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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 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.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	30.56%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	30.56%	29.00%
Data	7.64%	6.80%	5.37%	30.56%	18.75%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	28.00%	27.00%	26.00%	25.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED <i>Facts</i> file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	54

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	11
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	16

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
16	81	18.75%	28.00%	19.75%	Met target	No Slippage

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

The VIDE/SOSE definition of dropout for youth is a student enrolled at the beginning of the school year and 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)

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2021-22), the VIDE met and exceeded the target for FFY 2022 of 28% by 8.25%. This resulted in slippage for Measurement A of this Indicator.

During the FFY 2022 (School Year 2021-22), the VIDE/SOSE continued with the implementation of the State Results Driven Accountability Exiting Report (monthly exiting profiles), which requires each LEA to report monthly to the VIDE/SOSE for all students exiting the Part B program in all categories, with a specific focus being on the category as a dropout. These monthly exiting profiles capture particular data elements. These elements are (a) the name of the student, attending school, and, more explicitly, capturing the reason for exiting school before the end of that school year. Moreover, these monthly exiting report serves as a self-monitoring mechanism for each LEA and, more importantly, alignment with the highest level of services to ensure that children/youth with disabilities are pursuing the best existing options (i.e., regular high school diploma). Furthermore, this system allows for academic remediation, and the LEA identifies strategies that will provide each youth with the best option and workable strategy to help them pursue and obtain a regular high school diploma or, when appropriate, a certificate of completion.

The VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities through its ongoing engagement in professional development and technical assistance with each LEA through the use of resources obtained through its partnership with its national technical assistance centers, continues to serve as a guide to best practices relating to the development of quality IEPs that serve as a blueprint to help increase graduation rates while simultaneously decreasing dropouts and affecting the development of quality IEPs with sound transition plans. Along with the previously mentioned, the VIDE/SOSE continues to examine writing effective IEPs to make sure the provision and implementation of coordinated related services, including the thorough reviews of the LEA monthly exiting profiles, have all lent themselves very invaluable in providing the districts with the most effective practices to promote effective student-centered outcomes.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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	2021	100.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2021	93.94%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	85.51%
Math	A	Grade 4	2021	100.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2021	94.46%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	87.88%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	94.00%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	45	91	54
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	6	14	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	31	68	41
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6	5	8

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	45	92	53
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	6	15	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	31	70	44
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	6	5	8

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) 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.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	43	45	100.00%	100.00%	95.56%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	87	91	93.94%	94.00%	95.60%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	49	54	85.51%	95.00%	90.74%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target for FFY 2022 of 100% for Reading Assessment Participation in grade four (4). The VIDE/SOSE attribute the reason for slippage to the reduction of two (2) children in grade four (4) not participating in the regular Reading Assessment.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	43	45	100.00%	100.00%	95.56%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	90	92	98.46%	95.00%	97.83%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	52	53	87.88%	95.00%	98.11%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The VIDE/SOSE attribute the reason for slippage to the reduced number of children in grade four (4) not participating in the regular Math Assessment. Notably, while the VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target for grade four (4), there was a sizable increase of 10.23 % for grade 11 compared to FFY 2021.

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.

<https://vide.vi/blog/1949-school-report-card.html>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE is reporting for the second time on the participation rate; this participation rate is only for children with disabilities in grades four (4), eight (8), and eleven (11) and not that of the inclusive all grade levels as in the past. For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE utilized the EDFacts file spec FS185, Data Group: 588 prepopulated the VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded its target for Reading Assessment Participation in grades eight (8) and eleven (11).

The VIDE/SOSE will work closely to align, collaborate, and leverage resources with the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Development as well as district offices to leverage resources to identify strategies to help effectuate improvement for Indicators B3 and 17 and the U.S. Virgin Islands System of Support for School Success(VI-SOS).

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response Indicator B3A

The Virgin Islands revised its targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for High School Reading and Math to align with ESEA requirements of 95%.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR the Virgin Islands must provide updated baseline data for FFY 2021 for High School Math, as required by the Measurement Table.

The Virgin Islands did not provide targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for High School Reading and Math that align with ESEA requirements. The Virgin

Islands must provide FFYs 2021 through 2025 targets for High School Reading and Math in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Within 90 days of the receipt of the Virgin Islands' 2023 determination letter, Virgin Islands must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the Virgin Islands that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As per OSEP's required actions, the VIDE/SOSE has updated its baseline data for FFY 2021 for High School Math. For the FFY 2022, the VIDE/SOSE provided targets for participation for Children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in High School for Reading and Math. In addition, the VIDE/SOSE provided a link to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to show that it met the requirement for the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021. The VIDE/SOSE public report on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities can be accessed using the following link: <https://vide.vi/blog/1949-school-report-card.html>

3A - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator for High School Math using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The Virgin Islands revised its targets for this indicator, for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for High School Reading and High School Math and OSEP accepts those targets.

3A - Required Actions

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	2021	2.38%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2022	3.77%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2022	1.79%
Math	A	Grade 4	2021	0.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2022	0.00%
Math	C	Grade HS	2022	0.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	4.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	2.00%	3.00%	4.00%	4.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	2.00%	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	2.00%	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	2.00%	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative

district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational “meet and greet” workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE’s SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands’ capacity for diverse groups of parents.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	37	82	41
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3	1	2

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	37	85	44
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	0	0
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4	37	2.38%	3.00%	10.81%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3	82	3.77%	4.00%	3.66%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	2	41	1.79%	2.00%	4.88%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1	37	0.00%	2.00%	2.70%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	0	85	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	0	44	0.00%	2.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

<https://vide.vi/blog/1949-school-report-card.html>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the number of children with IEPs (grade-level academic achievement standards) who scored at or above proficient on reading for Reading Assessment in grades 4 (Group A and Grade 8 (Group B) and there was a slight decrease for Grade 11 (Group) when compared to FFY 2021 (School Year 2021-22) proficiency data.

In addition, for FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the number of children with IEPs (grade-level academic achievement standards) who scored at or above proficient on Math Assessment was only evident in grade 4(Group A). Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE recognizes the critical need to increase overall performance, precisely the number/percentage of children with IEPs who score at or above proficient on Reading and Math assessments. Thus, the VIDE/SOSE will work closely to align, collaborate, and leverage resources with the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Development as well as district offices to leverage resources to identify strategies to help effectuate improvement for Indicators B3 and 17 and the U.S. Virgin Islands System of Support for School Success (VI-SOS).

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response Indicator B3B.

The Virgin Islands revised its baseline data FFY2022 for Grade 8 Reading to that of 3.77% to match the historical data for FFY 2022 of 3.77%. In addition, the Virgin Islands has revised its High School Reading and Math baseline utilizing data for FFY 2022. As such, the baseline data for High School Reading and Math reflects FFY 2022

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

The Virgin Islands did not provide baseline data for Grade 8 Reading and Math and High School Reading and Math, and targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for Grade 8 Reading and Math and High School Reading and Math, as required by the Measurement Table. The Virgin Islands must provide the required baseline and targets through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As per OSEP's required actions, the VIDE/SOSE has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021 for Grade 8 and for High School Reading, to include stakeholder input. The FFY 2021 data showed that there were zero (0) children with IEPs who scored.

3B - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022 for High School Math, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator for Grade 8 Reading and High School Reading using data from FFY 2022; however, OSEP cannot accept Virgin Islands baseline data for Grade 8 Reading and High School Reading because the FFY 2022 baseline data reported in the historical data table does not match the FFY 2022 data reported in the data table for Grade 8 Reading and High School Reading. Therefore, OSEP cannot accept Virgin Islands target for Grade 8 Reading and High School Reading for FFY 2022.

3B - Required Actions

The Virgin Islands must provide the required baseline and targets for Grade 8 Reading and High School Reading in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

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 ED*Facts* 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	2021	60.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2021	0.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	0.00%
Math	A	Grade 4	2021	60.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2021	44.44%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	0.00%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%	61.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	2.00%	3.00%	3.00%	5.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	2.00%	3.00%	3.00%	5.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	60.00%	60.50%	61.00%	61.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	45.00%	45.50%	46.00%	46.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	4.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	6	5	8
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	2	2	6

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	6	5	8
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1	2	5

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2	6	60.00%	60.00%	33.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	2	5	0.00%	2.00%	40.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	6	8	0.00%	2.00%	75.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The VIDE/SOSE attribute the reason for slippage to the number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards on Reading assessment in grade 4 (Group A) to a decrease in the total number of children in grade 4 (group A with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards and also the slight increase in the number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the Alternate Assessment in FFY 2022 when compared to the FFY 2021 performance data.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1	6	60.00%	60.00%	16.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	2	5	44.44%	45.00%	40.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	5	8	0.00%	2.00%	62.50%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The VIDE/SOSE attributes the reason for slippage to the number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards on Math assessment in grades 4 (Group A) to a decrease in the total number of children with IEPs grades 4 (Group A) scoring at or above proficient against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards and also an increase in the number of children with IEPs in grade 4 (Group A) who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the Alternate Assessment.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The VIDE/SOSE attributes the reason for slippage to the number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards on Math assessment in grades 8 (Group B) to a decrease in the total number of children with IEPs in grades 8 (Group B) scoring at or above proficient against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards and also a decrease in the number of children with IEPs in grade 8 (Group B) who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the Alternate Assessment. Further, for grade 11, Group (C), the State met and exceeded the baseline and met and exceeded its target and performance compared to FFY 2021. Further, in FFY 2022 (school Year 2022-23) for grade 11, Group (C), the State met and exceeded the baseline and met and exceeded its target and performance compared to FFY 2021.

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.

<https://vide.vi/blog/1949-school-report-card.html>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE will work closely to align, collaborate, and leverage resources with the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Development as well as district offices to leverage resources to identify strategies to help effectuate improvement for Indicators B3 and 17 and the U.S. Virgin Islands System of Support for School Success(VI-SOS).

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response**3C - Required Actions**

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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	2021	10.72
Reading	B	Grade 8	2021	15.18
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	27.58
Math	A	Grade 4	2021	5.36
Math	B	Grade 8	2021	6.08
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	4.69

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	10.50	10.50	10.00	10.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	15.00	15.00	14.50	14.50
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	27.50	27.50	27.00	26.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	5.10	5.10	5.00	5.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	5.90	5.90	5.50	5.50
Math	C <=	Grade HS	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.10

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	740	830	650
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	37	82	41
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	101	110	198
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	1	2
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	0
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3	1	2

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	739	836	667
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	37	85	44
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	52	20	31
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	0	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	0	0

f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
---	---	---	---

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10.81%	14.19%	10.72	10.50	3.38	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.66%	13.37%	15.18	15.00	9.71	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.88%	30.77%	27.58	27.50	25.89	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2.70%	7.17%	5.36	5.10	4.47	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	0.00%	2.39%	6.08	5.90	2.39	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	0.00%	4.65%	4.69	4.50	4.65	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE will work closely to align, collaborate, and leverage resources with the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Development as well as district offices to leverage resources to identify strategies to help effectuate improvement for Indicators B3 and 17 and the U.S. Virgin Islands System of Support for School Success(VI-SOS).

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of 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 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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 rate 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The count of students with disabilities data are used for this specific indicator and is obtained from the December 1, 2021 618 Child Count Data for Children with Disabilities. The Districts also 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. All ethnic groups of students (African American/Blacks; Hispanic/Latinos; Whites; Two or More Races (Multi-Race); Pacific Islanders; Native Americans; Asians) are included in the discipline data count of students who are suspended and/or expelled for greater than 10 days in the school year (2021-2022). The VIDE/SOSE compares its suspensions removals of greater than 10 days of Special Education students to the rate students without disabilities are suspended. No ethnic groups are excluded from the calculations of students suspended or expelled during the school year 2021-2022. The State verifies the reliability and accuracy of the State's lag Year data through automated verification checks through its database.

Discipline data from this system are utilized to satisfy 618 data collection which is reported via Ed Facts 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 2021-2022. As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the State conducted a virtual desk audit for FFY 2022 of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the School Year of 2021-2022.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 discipline data report for this indicator is taken from the EdFacts FS006 data submission "Child with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions". This submission captures the cumulative length of removals of students with disabilities and reports a count of students by race/ethnicity who were subject to suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. It reports a separate count of students with removals greater than ten days based on whether the removal was out-of-school (used for this indicator) or in-school.

As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the VIDE/SOSE conducted a virtual desk of all students suspended for greater than 10 days in school

year 2021-2022 in preparation for the February 1, 2024 APR submission. The discipline data for the reported school year 2021-2022 reported that no student was suspended for greater than 10 days in the reported school year 2021-2022 for either District 1 (St.Croix) or District 2 (St.Thomas/St.John). Thus, the VIDE/SOSE did not identify nor issue any findings of noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR Section 300.170(b).

To ensure continued adherence to applicable federal regulations for this indicator, the district offices conducted in-house professional development training for both district and school personnel on discipline procedures, including the types of suspensions and classroom management. District 2 (St. Thomas/St. John) district offices also attended off-island training on PBIS. School Administrators in both districts are encouraged to utilize the Suspension and Expulsions Administrator's Checklist, which highlights what to do in the event of an infraction.

The State did not identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR Section 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 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	2	0.00%	0%	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

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 rate ratio methodology that compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities by race and ethnicity in each LEA to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for all children by race and ethnicity within the same LEA.

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 suspensions 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

The Discipline Data used for this indicator are taken from the EDFacts FS006 data submission :Child with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions" submission which captures the data for the overall student population in the rate of suspensions/expulsion of students with IEPs in six racial/ethnic groups. The percentage of students with IEPs suspended for greater than 10 days in a school year (2021-2022) are then compared to the overall student population for suspension/expulsion in that same district. This reporting captures a separate count of students with removals greater than 10 days based on whether the removal was out-of-school (data used for this indicator) or in-school suspension. 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 databases.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the State conducted a desk audit of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the School Year of 2021-2022. The discipline data which is used in determining significant discrepancy for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR due February 1, 2024, revealed that neither District 1 (St. Croix) nor District 2 (Thomas/St. John) had students suspended/expelled for greater than ten days. Thus, the State did not identify nor issue any findings of non-compliance with Part B requirements for this specific indicator.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 ED Facts 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	54.00%	56.00%	58.44%	58.89%	58.89%
A	58.44%	Data	57.30%	57.60%	58.44%	58.89%	55.50%
B	2019	Target <=	20.00%	20.00%	21.37%	20.30%	20.30%
B	21.37%	Data	19.61%	22.38%	21.37%	20.30%	21.04%
C	2019	Target <=	3.05%	2.95%	2.44%	2.63%	2.63%
C	2.44%	Data	3.98%	2.87%	2.44%	2.63%	2.64%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other

pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	842
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	453
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	209
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	12
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	3
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	4

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	453	842	55.50%	58.89%	53.80%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	209	842	21.04%	20.30%	24.82%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	19	842	2.64%	2.63%	2.26%	Met target	No Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
A	The VIDE/SOSE can attribute this slippage to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams' members agreed that the academic and functional needs of the children not included in Measurement A of this indicator were unable to be met in inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.						
B	The VIDE/SOSE can attribute this slippage to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams' members agreeing that the children's academic and functional needs would be best met inside the regular class less than 40% of the day as such this setting is most suitable for those children counted in Measurement B of this Indicator.						

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Measurement A: Measurement A: For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), using the (December 1, 2022, Child Count) four hundred and fifty three (453) or (53.80%) out of eight hundred forty-two (842) children with IEPs aged five (5) to include five (5) year olds in kindergarten through 21 were in the regular class for more than 80% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target for FFY 2022 of 58.89% by 5.09%. This resulted in slippage for Measurement A of this Indicator.

Measurement B: Measurement B: For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) using the (December 1, 2022, Child Count Data) two hundred and -nine (209) or (24.82%) out of eight hundred forty-two (842) children with IEPs aged five (5) to include five (5) year olds in kindergarten through twenty-one (21) were in the regular class less than 40% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target for FFY 2022 of 20.30% by 4.52%. This resulted in slippage for Measurement B of this Indicator.

Measurement C: For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) using the (December 1, 2022, Child Count Data) nineteen (19) or (2.26%) out of eight hundred forty-two (842) of children with IEPs aged five (5) to include five (5) year olds in kindergarten through twenty-one (21) were in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. The VIDE/SOSE met the target of 2.63% for FFY 2022. Thus, per OSEP's guidelines, there is no slippage for Measurement C of this Indicator.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response**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 ED Facts 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 (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	94.00%	94.50%	97.44%	97.44%	97.44%
A	Data	91.27%	81.11%	97.44%	98.72%	76.12%
B	Target <=	4.25%	1.19%	1.28%	1.28%	1.28%
B	Data	7.14%	12.22%	1.28%	0.00%	0.00%
C	Target <=				0.00%	0.00%
C	Data				1.28%	22.39%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative

district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational “meet and greet” workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE’s SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands’ capacity for diverse groups of parents.

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	2021	22.39%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	97.44%	97.44%	97.50%	97.50%
Target B <=	1.28%	1.25%	1.25%	1.25%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	22.39%	22.39%	22.39%	22.00%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	50	30	0	80
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	41	28	0	69
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. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	9	2	0	11

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	69	80	76.12%	97.44%	86.25%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	0	80	0.00%	1.28%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	11	80	22.39%	22.39%	13.75%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Measurement A: For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-22) using the (December 1, 2022, Child Count) sixty-nine (69) out of eighty (80) or (86.25 %) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged five (5) who are in kindergarten) 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 did not meet the target for FFY 2022 of 97.44 % by 11.19%. Though the VIDE/SOSE did not meet its target for Measurement A, it is noteworthy that the VIDE/SOSE has demonstrated improvement compared to the performance of FY 2021 of 76.12%, thus narrowing the slippage by 10.13%. In addition, per OSEP's guidelines, there is no slippage for Measurement A of this Indicator.

Measurement B: For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-22), using the (December 1, 2022 Child Count) zero (0) out of eighty (80) or (0%) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged five (5) who are in kindergarten) 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 2022 of 1.28% for Measurement 6B of this Indicator.

Measurement C: For FFY 2022 (School Year) using the (December 1, 2022 Child Count) eleven (11) out of eighty (80) or (13.75%) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged five (5) who are in kindergarten) were receiving special education and related services in the home. The VIDE/SOSE inadvertently did not set the new baseline and include targets for FFY 2021. At that time, there were fifteen (15) children, or 22.39% of the total number of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged five (5) who are in kindergarten) were receiving special education and related services in the home. Thus, this FFY 2022 includes the baseline and target-setting year for FFY 2021. As a result, The VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded the target for FFY 2022 of 22.39% for Measurement 6C of this Indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response Indicator 6C

The Virgin Islands has revised its baseline data to align with the historical data of FFY 2021, which stands at 22.39%. Additionally, the language used in the report has been revised to accurately represent the status of the 11 children with IEPs aged 3 through 5. The revised narrative now states that 'eleven' (11) out of eighty (80) or (13.75%) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged (5) who are in kindergarten) were receiving special education and related services in the home.'

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must ensure the data reported in the data table are consistent with its narrative for this indicator.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As per OSEP's required actions for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands reported data table is consistent with its narrative for this indicator.

6 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for sub-indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The Virgin Islands revised its targets for sub-indicator 6C, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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 3 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2008	Target >=	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	40.00%	40.00%
A1	9.90%	Data	94.44%	100.00%	100.00%	40.00%	84.09%

A2	2008	Target >=	42.00%	42.00%	42.50%	62.50%	62.50%
A2	12.00%	Data	60.00%	77.78%	77.78%	62.50%	53.33%
B1	2008	Target >=	68.50%	69.00%	69.00%	40.00%	40.00%
B1	14.10%	Data	75.00%	95.24%	95.24%	40.00%	79.49%
B2	2008	Target >=	33.00%	33.50%	33.50%	57.14%	57.14%
B2	16.00%	Data	56.67%	64.44%	66.67%	57.14%	45.00%
C1	2008	Target >=	79.00%	79.50%	79.50%	65.22%	65.20%
C1	11.30%	Data	72.22%	100.00%	100.00%	65.22%	81.08%
C2	2008	Target >=	41.00%	42.00%	42.00%	56.25%	56.30%
C2	13.00%	Data	60.00%	75.56%	77.78%	56.25%	62.22%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

78

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	7	8.97%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	8	10.26%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	22	28.21%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	33	42.31%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	8	10.26%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	55	70	84.09%	40.50%	78.57%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	41	78	53.33%	62.50%	52.56%	Did not meet 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	10	12.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3	3.85%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	26	33.33%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	35	44.87%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4	5.13%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	61	74	79.49%	40.00%	82.43%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	39	78	45.00%	57.14%	50.00%	Did not meet 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	7	8.97%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	2	2.56%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	13	16.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	40	51.28%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	16	20.51%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	53	62	81.08%	65.20%	85.48%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	56	78	62.22%	56.30%	71.79%	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 (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

The VIDE/SOSE defines "comparable to same-age peers" as the approximate capabilities of children of a given age across various settings and situations. However, those capabilities can be demonstrated. Functioning comparable to a level as their same-age peers is not determined by a single score on a norm-referenced test or other single assessment result. However, these scores are used along with other sources of information to inform the decision about a child's status in a given outcome or whether or not progress is made. This definition was adapted from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO).

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

The VIDE/SOSE for FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) will continue to report data from the Child Observation Record Advantage (COR) online system. The Virgin Islands Department of Human Services, Head Start Program (VIDOHHSP) uses the COR assessment tool and its online platform to obtain the performance (entrance and exit) ratings for all preschool children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) enrolled in Head Start Preschool Programs. The COR utilizes a 0- to 7-point scale to score children on a variety of discrete objectives. Coincidentally, the COR's rating scale and the COS rating scale both have a maximum of 7 points. The COR's scale is age-referenced on each objective for children ages birth through 7 years (8 total points for each objective).

The VIDOHHSP and preschool personnel extract entry and exit data from the COR online system to provide the respective data. This data extraction includes each preschool child attending the Head Start Program that receives special education and related services; once the extraction is complete, the disaggregated data is forwarded to the VIDE/SOSE for data analysis and tabulation to report for Child Outcomes A, B, and C of this indicator.

VIDE/SOSE has developed its own algorithm to convert raw scores from children's entry and exit periods from the COR to the Child Outcomes progress categories. According to the assessment publisher, a raw score of 3 is considered a typical milestone for 3-year-olds on any one COR objective, 4 is typical for 4-year-olds, etc. Moreover, VIDOHHSP has determined that a level 3 on COR's scale is the age expectation for children who enter Preschool programs from Early Head Start and that children exiting Preschool Head Start Programs would be meeting age expectations for Kindergarten readiness when they are at a level 5 or 6 on COR's scale. VIDE/SOSE has determined that an average score of 3.5 across all COR objectives cross-walked to a given Child Outcome represents overall age-appropriate functioning for the purpose of Child Outcomes measurement, which is a key business rule within the algorithm.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/BOSE continued to work closely with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Center for IDEA Data Systems (DaSy), and the Virgin Islands Department of Human Services, Head Start Programs (VIDOHHSP), to fulfill the data collection and tabulation for this Indicator. Virgin Islands does not use the COS process as ECTA defines it. Rather, the Virgin Islands uses an algorithm to convert assessment ratings from our primary assessment tool, the Child Observation Record Advantage (COR), to the Child Outcomes indicators. The COR uses a 0- to 7-point rating scale to score children on a variety of discrete objectives. It is coincidental that the COR's rating scale and the COS rating scale both have a maximum 7 points. They are not equivalent. The COR's scale is age-referenced on each objective for children ages birth through 7 years (8 total points for each objective).

VIDE/BOSE Clarification to OSEP Response Indicator B7

VIDE/BOSE has developed its own algorithm to convert raw scores from children's entry and exit periods from the COR to the Child Outcomes progress categories. This algorithm draws assessment scores from multiple COR objectives across multiple domains: 5 objectives from the COR's Social/Emotional domain feed Outcome A; 21 objectives from the COR's Approaches to Learning, Language/Literacy/Communication, Mathematics, Creative Arts, Science/Technology, and Social Studies domains feed Outcome B; and 6 objectives from the COR's Approaches to Learning, Physical Development/Health, and Science/Technology domains feed Outcome C (see ECTA's High/Scope COR Advantage-to-Outcomes instrument crosswalk at <https://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/crosswalks.asp>). According to the assessment publisher, a raw score of 3 is considered a typical milestone for 3-year-olds on any given COR objective, 4 is typical for 4-year-olds, etc. Moreover, the Virgin Islands Department of Human Services, Head Start Program (VIDOHHSP) has determined that a level 3 on COR's scale is the age expectation for children who enter Preschool programs from Early Head Start and that children exiting Preschool Head Start Programs would be meeting age expectations for Kindergarten readiness when they are at a level 5 or 6 on COR's scale. VIDE/BOSE has determined that an average score of 3.5 across all COR objectives cross-walked to a given Child Outcome represents overall age-appropriate functioning for the purpose of preschool Child Outcomes measurement, which is a key business rule within the algorithm.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, the Virgin Islands must explain any discrepancies between the FFY 2022 total number assessed and the FFY 2022 denominator in its calculation of the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

For the FFY 2022 VIDE/BOSE, there is no discrepancy between the total number assessed and the FFY 2022 denominator in its calculation of the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

7 - OSEP Response

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 3 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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

For the FFY 2021 and FFY 2022, the VIDE continued to gather comprehensive stakeholder input on the performance and targets of the reconfigured Indicator clusters (3, 5, 6, 7, and 8). This cluster strategy ensures repetitiveness across all indicators, which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies. To establish targets, the VIDE/SOSE shared both historical and recent performance as well as the importance of new requirements which is to ensure that VIDE/SOSE demonstrates that the demographics of the parents responding to the parental satisfaction survey are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	76.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	83.50%	83.50%	83.50%	79.71%	77.00%
Data	84.68%	84.66%	90.10%	79.71%	78.76%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	77.50%	78.00%	78.00%	78.50%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
405	493	78.76%	77.50%	82.15%	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.

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE continued to utilize one survey instrument to collect data for children ages three (3) – five (5) (five-year-olds not in kindergarten) and six (6) through twenty-one (21)-including) (five-year-olds in kindergarten).

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

992

Percentage of respondent parents

49.70%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	46.25%	49.70%

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

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the University of the Virgin Islands Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC), in conjunction with the VIDE/SOSE, employed the chi-square test for independence to assist with understanding if there is a relationship between the students for whom the parents responded and the students for whom parents did not respond and a specific demographic characteristic. Further, this analytical instrument is designed to ascertain whether or not there is a significant difference between the respondents and non-respondents using the demographic characteristics, in this instance, race/ethnicity and disability category.

Include the State's analyses of 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.

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022/23), the VIDE/SOSE's analysis revealed that the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children and youth receiving special education services in the United States Virgin Islands. Further, the representativeness as it relates to the total number of parents to whom the surveys of 992, Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) accounted for the highest disability category. More specifically, parents of students with SLD accounted for a 47.8 percent response rate, while parents of students with Autism accounted for 52.1 percent completion of survey responses. In addition, when categorizing representativeness by race and age, Black/African Americans represented 76 percent of the population. They accounted for 75% percent of parental respondents, denoting that the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, notably, with the highest numbers in the age range of 13 and 15-year-olds. On the other hand, Hispanic/Latino represented 20.1 percent of the demographic characteristics relating to race/ethnicity and accounted for 22.8 percent, denoting an excess of 2.7% of parental respondents, not more than +3% notably, that the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Moreover, for FFY 2022 (SY2021-22), the VIDE/SOSE has a response rate of 49.70%, representing the total number of parents/guardians of children with disabilities who responded to the survey. This performance data demonstrated an increase of 3.45 % when compared to the performance for FFY 2021 of 46.25% for the number of respondent parents/guardians. The VIDE/SOSE will continue working closely with special education district offices to identify strategies to increase parents' knowledge relative to the importance of the survey and encourage their participation.

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

YES

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 and the University of the Virgin Islands, Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC) created and utilized graphics using info graphical depiction to translate some findings into understandable communicative units. This graphical image encompassed the following: (a) parental knowledge of rights, (b) mindfulness/respect of culture and language, (c) benefits of early Intervention programs, and (d) parental perception of response to intervention/instruction school-wide program(s), to name a few. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to work closely with the District Offices of Special Education to UVI/ECC and its Division of Public Relations to promote the collection of these data by using its public service campaigns.

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.

For FFY 2022 (2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE utilized a chi-square test to determine any visible nonresponse bias to ascertain the degree to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded to the survey are representative of the demographics of the entire group of children receiving special education services. The initial entail phase of the analysis examined whether there were differences with that of the whole student body across several demographic features. In addition, a chi-square test was utilized to identify if there were differences between the respondents and the non-respondents and if there was any variation by demographic characteristics. Further, the variation in the number of respondents, namely by race/ethnicity, differed by no more than 3%. The race/ethnicity included in this examination to determine non-response bias are Black/African American (non-Hispanic), Hispanic/Latino, White (non-Hispanic), Pacific Islander/ Native American, and Two or More Races. In addition to race/ethnicity, disability categories of Autism, Developmental Delays, Emotional Disturbance, Hearing Impairment, Multiple Disabilities, Other Health Impairments, Speech Language Impairments, Specific Learning Disability, Traumatic Brain Injury, Orthopedic Impairment, Intellectual Disabilities, and Visual Impairment were also included in the analysis for FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) and was within the +/-3 range.

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) and Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC) have conducted the VIDE's parent satisfaction survey since the beginning of the State Performance Plan (SPP). As such, the VIDE procured services and entered into its tenth (10th) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the ECC to perform telephonic surveys for the collection analysis and generation and public reporting of the FFY 2022 parental satisfaction survey results. 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.

Process/Procedures/Methods

Each parent of a child between the ages of three (3) through five (5) and six (6) through twenty-one (21) is called and encouraged to respond to the survey. Although ECC contacts every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and families who (a) refuse to respond to the survey, (b) cannot be reached by telephone, (c) moved, (d) failed to update telephone numbers; and (e) do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey.

The University of the Virgin Islands (UVI) and Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC) utilize a computer-assisted telephone design, which allows for the immediate capturing of survey data and enhances the reviewing and securing all confidential survey data. Additionally, the UVI/ECC uses stringent standards for collecting survey data that require the interviewer to make calls at varying times of the day, including during daytime hours, evening hours, weekends, and holidays. Each interviewer has a script, demonstrated by the project director and rehearsed several times during training. The practice/rehearsals involve both the project lead/supervisory and the interviewers-with each individual at the training taking turns ---both conducting and responding to the survey, which is done to ensure that all survey takers are reading the script accurately and fluently. In addition, these strict standards require the interviewers to call parents/guardians at varying times of the day, including calls during daytime hours, evening hours, weekends, and holidays.

In addition, a prescribed number of attempts 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 to maximize the chances of reaching parents and guardians. This ensures all parents of children receiving special education and related services are contacted, eliminating any chance of non-response biases.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The Virgin Islands did not provide targets. The Virgin Islands must provide the required targets through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, including a description of the stakeholder input process for revising its targets.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must report the demographic categories used in its analysis to determine whether the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. In addition, the Virgin Islands must report the metric used to determine representativeness.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The Virgin Islands' Response to the required actions for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR is listed below.

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022/23), the VIDE/SOSE's analysis revealed that the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children and youth receiving special education services in the United States Virgin Islands. Further, the representativeness as it relates to the total number of parents to whom the surveys of 992, Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) accounted for the highest disability category. More specifically, parents of students with SLD accounted for a 47.8 response rate, while parents of students with Autism accounted for 52.1 completion of survey responses. In addition, when categorizing representativeness by race and age, Black/African Americans represented 75% of the population, with the highest numbers in the age range of 13 and 15-year-olds.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for 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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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.

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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 population examined is for any student identified as eligible for special education in each race or ethnic group. Data of one school year (2022-2023) is aggregated in all racial/ethnic groups for all children aged 5 who are in kindergarten, in addition to children aged 6 through 21 who are served under IDEA.

DATA SOURCE

The data source for this Indicator is Public School Student Enrollment data for All Students by Race and Ethnicity dated September 30, 2022 from PRE, and data collected under IDEA Section 618 - Child Count dated December 1, 2022 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as Amended 2004).

The 618 Child Count data are collected via EDPlan, the VIDE/SOSE 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, 2022 and Special Education data captured on December 1, 2022 Annual Child Count, were used in determining whether or not the two districts (District 1: St. Thomas/St. John) and District 2: St. Croix) were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Disproportionate Representation is present in any district where the relative difference in composition for any race or ethnic group in comparison to the total population of non-disabled students in that same district is 20% or more. The VIDE/SOSE uses a minimum "n" of 10, which means that there must be at least 10 students in that specific racial and ethnic groups.

Methodology

The methodology for determining disproportionate representation is 1) the percent of students by race who are enrolled in the district; 2) compare those percentages to the percent of students of each race or ethnicity that is identified for special education; and 3) indicate that if the identification of any race or ethnicity for special education is greater than 20% of that race or ethnic groups representation in the enrollment. If that race or ethnic group is greater than 20%, then that race is identified as having disproportionate representation.

The Relative differences in racial/ethnic composition comparison:

A = Number of children in disability category from a racial/ethnic group ÷ Total # of children in the district in that particular disability category x 100 = %
B = Number of students from a racial/ethnic group enrolled in district ÷ Total number of all students enrolled in district x 100 = %.

Disproportionate Representation (Overrepresentation) = Relative difference in composition exceeds 20%.

Note: calculations are completed for only those disability eligibility categories and racial/ethnic categories that meet the minimum "n" size of 10.

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

Utilizing the Child Count data and the approved methodology, the State determined that District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) meets the minimum "n" of 10 children/students with disabilities receiving special education and related services for African American/Black students, White students and Hispanic/Latino students. There were no racial/ethnic group with a relative difference that exceeded the 20% threshold, thus the St. Thomas/St. District was not required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis for this Indicator.

District 2 (St. Croix). The State has determined that District 2 meets the minimum "n" of 10 students with disabilities receiving special education and related services for African American/Black students; White Students; Two ore More Races (Multi-Race) and Hispanic/Latino students. The racial/ethnic groups with a relative difference that exceeded the 20% threshold were White Students and Two or More Races (Multi-Race). 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 was required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis (FSA) that addresses the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referral for Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards. Subsequently, the State reviewed the St. Croix District's response on the FSA and determined that the District is compliant with IDEA regulations relative to policies, practices, and procedures in each of the areas addressed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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 and District 1 (St. Croix) response to the FSA, the State determined that both District 2 (St. Thomas/St. John) and District 2 (St. Croix) are compliant with the IDEA regulations relative to this specific indicator. Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE Compliance Unit conducted a desk audit of randomly selected student files for both Districts from May 22, 2022, to July 11, 2023 (using data for the period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, to verify that the files contained evidence verifying no inappropriate identification in the specific ethnic/racial categories.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response**9 - Required Actions**

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 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 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). 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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.

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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. Data for the school year (School Year 2022-2023) is aggregated across all disability categories in racial/ethnic groups for all children aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten, in addition to children aged 6 through 21 who are served under IDEA. 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. The VIDE/SOSE uses a minimum "n" of 10. Calculations are completed only for those eligibility and racial/ethnic categories that meet the minimum "n" size of 10. In other words, there must be at least ten students in the specific disability category in the district in order for the relative difference in composition to be calculated.

METHODOLOGY

The VIDE/SOSE utilized one year of data (Public School Student Enrollment data for School Year 2022-2023) from PRE and data from the December 1, 2022 Child Count, together with the relative difference in composition calculation, to determine 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 same ethnic group. Calculations are completed for those eligibilities 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 for this indicator are the Public School Student Enrollment Data for All Students by Race and Ethnicity captured on September 30, 2022, and December 1, 2022, Child Count 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). The 618 Child Count data are collected via the VIDE/SOSE's Student Data Management System (EDPlan) and reported to the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education, via the EDFacts online electronic reporting system. The public school enrollment data from the Division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) captured on September 30, 2022, and the special education data captured on December 1, 2022, along with the approved methodology stated above, are 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. Croix. Using the above criteria, District 2 had at least the minimum "n" of 10 African American/Black students in all six disability categories, and Hispanic/Latino students had at least the minimum "n" of 10 in three of the six disability categories. Based on the federally approved calculations and formula noted above, the St. Croix District had a relative difference of 20% or more between the percentage of children receiving special education and related services in two of the six (6) noted disability categories who are from any racial/ethnic group when compared with non-disabled students in the same racial/ethnic group in that same district. Specifically, Hispanic/Latino students exceeded the 20% or more relative difference in the disability category of Specific Learning Disability when compared with non-disabled students in the same racial/ethnic group in that same district. African American/Black students exceeded the 20% relative difference in the disability category of Emotional Disturbance when compared with non-disabled students in the same racial/ethnic group. Thus, District 2 was required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis for Indicator 10. The self-analysis contained questions that addressed the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Intervention, Child Find, Referral for Evaluation, Evaluation, Eligibility and Placement, and Procedural Safeguards. The VIDE/SOSE reviewed the District's response and analysis and concluded that the over-representation identified in the disability category of Specific Learning Disability in the racial/ethnic category group for Hispanic/Latino and the over-representation identified in the disability category of Emotional Disturbance for African American/Black students when compared to the same

racial/ethnic group in the enrolled population in that district was not the result of inappropriate identification.

District 2: (St. Thomas/St. John). Using the above criteria, District 1 had the minimum "n" of 10 African American/Black students in five of the six disability categories. Hispanic/Latino students had at least the minimum "n" of 10 in one of the disability categories. Based on the federally approved calculations and formula noted above, District 1 did not have 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/ethnic group when compared with non-disabled students in the same racial/ethnic group in that same district. Thus, the St. Thomas/St. John's district was not considered to have disproportionate representation for Indicator 10 and, as such, was not required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis for this specific indicator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Pursuant to the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures Manual, once a district is flagged as having exceeded the 20% threshold, resulting in disproportionate over-representation, they are required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis that addresses the specific areas identified in a previous topical area. The VIDE/SOSE Compliance Unit, between May 22, 2023, and July 11, 2023, using data for the reporting period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023 conducted a desk audit of randomly selected student files, using the State's Student Data Management System (EDPlan), to verify that the files contained evidence to verify data accuracy and validity and to ensure that the District was compliant with IDEA policies, practices and procedures in each of the areas addressed in the FSA.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	90.48%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
143	143	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

The State's established timeline for an initial evaluation is 45 days and is consistent with the IDEA federal regulations at 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B). All of the students whose parental consent was received during the period of July 1, 2022 -June 30, 2023, were evaluated within the 45-day 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.

The method that the State used to collect data for this specific indicator are obtained from two primary sources: (1) EDPlan (formerly Goalview, student data management system) and (2) monthly Initial Evaluation Reports which are received from the Districts, monthly. This monthly submission represents a reporting of all children referred for initial evaluation during that time period. The VIDE/SOSE captures all of the data elements for each child in an internal, self-calculating Worksheet (i.e. name, date of birth, school, grade level, date of referral, date consent received, date of evaluation, date of IEPs, eligibility determination, and any exception). This internal worksheet is used by the compliance monitoring unit to compare the information in both data sets to ensure that the data recorded on the district monthly report and the student information uploaded in EDPlan are accurate and consistent with federal regulations 34 CFR Section 300.300 and 20 U.S.C 1416(a)(3)(B), as reported by the districts.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE implemented a new student data management system (EDPlan) in School Year 2022-2023, which captures the comprehensive and unique education collection and reporting process (referral, consent, evaluation/reevaluation, eligibility, IEP development, and finalization and exiting data). This new student data system has self-monitoring procedures with built-in-system-generated automated alerts, which will assist the districts with any errors in inputting students' demographic information and ensure the collection of valid and reliable data, resulting in meeting compliance while improving results.

For the reporting period of July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023, a desk audit was conducted by the VIDE/SOSE compliance monitoring unit during the period of May 23, 2023, to July 11, 2023, on eighty (80) randomly selected students (40 students per district) who were referred for initial evaluations. The desk audit comprised of a comparison of the Data Report 1.A-1: Initial Evaluations and the Student Data Management System (EDPlan) to verify that the data reported were timely, accurate, valid, and reliable. A breakdown of each district's monitoring activity is highlighted below.

District 1 (St. Croix) - a total of forty (40) students were randomly selected for monitoring purposes during the monitoring period of May 23, 2023 to July 11, 2023. Of the forty (40) students selected for compliance monitoring purposes and for whom parental consent to evaluate was received, 3 did not qualify for special education services; 1 parent declined special education services after evaluation; 1 parent withdrew her referral; 1 student transferred out of the district but is known to be continuing. All of the students were evaluated within the state's 45-day established timeline for initial evaluation. During the school year 2022-2023 (FFY 2022), a total of seventy-one (71) children were referred for initial evaluation during the period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, and reported on the district's monthly Data Report 1.A-1: Initial Evaluations.

District 2 (St. Thomas/St. John) - a total of forty (40) students were randomly selected for monitoring purposes during the monitoring period of May 23, 2023 to July 11, 2023. Of the forty (40) students selected for compliance monitoring purposes and for whom parental consent to evaluate was received, 3 did not qualify for special education services. All of the students selected for monitoring were evaluated within the state's 45-day established timeline for initial evaluation. During the school year 2022-2023 (FFY 2022), a total of seventy-one (71) children were referred for initial evaluation during the period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023, and reported on the district's monthly Data Report 1.A-1: Initial Evaluations.

In addition to the scheduled compliance monitoring activity noted above, the compliance monitoring unit conducts bi-monthly random checks of the information reported by the district and notifies the district of any inconsistencies and/or missing information that is needed to ensure that each district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of the data. In those instances where there is a discrepancy and/or missing data element, the District is informed and is given thirty (30) days in which to verify and/or correct such data discrepancy that was subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system. The district must provide evidence of the corrections of each case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Accordingly, the VIDE/SOSE did not identify nor issue any findings of noncompliance for either district (LEA) for this Fiscal Year2022 reporting period.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response – Indicator 11

Although the VIDE/SOSE Compliance Unit conducted bi-monthly random checks of the information reported by the district in its monthly data report, based on the review of the data, the State did not identify any areas of noncompliance as the information uploaded in the special education student data

management system (EDPlan) was consistent with what was reported by the LEAs in their monthly reports. Thus, the VIDE/SOSE did not issue any findings of noncompliance for this Indicator as the data reported is accurate, verifying that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	70.97%	100.00%	100.00%	97.56%	97.37%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	55
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	3

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	43
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.	9
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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	43	43	97.37%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

0

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State monitoring

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

The VIDE/SOSE collects data from each Local Education Agency (LEA) on all children referred from the Part C programs before age 3 for eligibility determination under 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.

The following is the data source for this indicator: (a) the State Monitoring system, (b) the State online Special Education Student Management System ("EDPlan"), and (c) the State database that houses all data for the respective reporting year FFY 2021 (e.g., children born between July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022/23), there were an additional nine (9) children in "a" that is not in b, c, or e but included in "d" who were provided services in Part C and referred to Part B prior to their 3rd birthdays. The breakdown for the additional nine (9) children is as follows: (a) seven (7) children's parents refused Part B services, and (b) two (2) children's parents requested a staffing/service delay.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	0	1	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To verify that the respective district with the noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, the VIDE/SOSE reviewed updated data collected via its monitoring activities and electronic data system review of student records.

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

To verify the correction of the identified non-compliance, the VIDE/SOSE reviewed the one child's record for FFY 2021 and found it to be compliant, satisfying prong 2 of OSEP's 09-02 memo.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	1	1	0

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

During FFY 2022, the VIDE/SOSE has verified that the respective LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 is meeting the requirements noted in the OSEP 09-02 memo and is (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements meeting 100% compliance for this indicator (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) premised on the VIDE/SOSE's review of updated data collected via its monitoring activities and electronic data system review of student records, and (2) that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, which is consistent with that of OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

To verify the correction of the identified non-compliance, the VIDE/SOSE reviewed the one child's record for FFY 2020 and found it to be compliant, satisfying prong 2 of OSEP's 09-02 memo. Further, the child-specific noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was corrected within the one-year timeline of identification/in a timely manner as noted in the section Prior FFY Required Actions.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the Virgin Islands reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the Virgin Islands must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the Virgin Islands must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the Virgin Islands must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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 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 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

To verify the correction of the identified non-compliance, the VIDE/SOSE reviewed the one child's record report for FFY 2021 and found it to be compliant, satisfying prong 2 of OSEP's 09-02 memo. Further, the child-specific noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was corrected within the one-year timeline of identification/in a timely manner as noted in the section Prior FFY Required Actions.

Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE has verified that the respective LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 is meeting the requirements noted in the OSEP 09-02 memo and is (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements meeting 100% compliance for this indicator (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) premised on the VIDE/SOSE's review of updated data collected via its monitoring activities and electronic data system review of student records, and (2) that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, which is consistent with that of OSEP Memo 09-02.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
378	378	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE extracted student-level data from the online state student management system "EDPlan" to create an internal spreadsheet consisting of all students with Individuals with Disabilities (IEPs) who are age 14 and older for the reporting period from July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023. The collection of these data from its inception has always included all children/youth in grades 9-12 (high school) to include children/youth 14 years of age and older. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE continues to promote the use of best practices with its Local Education Agencies (LEAs) as prescribed by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) and requires that each LEA include children/youth in high school commencing at age 14, and older. The utilization of best practices ensures that each child/youth has an effective Individualized Education Program (IEP) that contains the required components for secondary transition.

To ensure this occurs, the VIDE/SOSE reviews the IEPs of each child/youth through desk audit, captured on the spreadsheet using the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) Indicator 13 checklist for compliance with the regulatory transition requirements. If the respective IEP section of EDplan does not contain the required information, the VIDE/SOSE reviews additional documents in the child/youth EDPlan electronic file to determine if the record contains evidence of compliance with the transition requirements. If any of the required evidence is not found in the student's file or online student management system "EDPlan," the item on the checklist is marked ("no") for non-compliance.

For the FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), all three hundred and seventy-eight (378) IEPs reviewed using the checklist complied with the regulatory transition requirements.

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 2022 (SY 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE reviewed three hundred and seventy-eight 378 IEPs to ensure they all contained the elements on the State's Indicator 13 Effective IEPs Checklist for compliance with the regulatory transition requirements. The VIDE/SOSE checklist adapted from the NTACT resource center also includes that added as part of the elements evidence that the student was invited to an IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. All 378 IEPs met the elements on the State checklist.

Further, the VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with the NTACT resource center to ensure that the most effective review of each element on the checklist is maintained. The effective writing of IEPs has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in this cluster of indicators (B1, 2, 13, and 14). Moreover, the State's scaling up of ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners continues to be the primary catalyst for building capacity for effective student outcomes at the LEA level. The State continues to rely on its national affiliates, especially NTACT, to guide its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality/compliant IEPs and transition planning, and, more importantly, improve post-school outcomes.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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).

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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target ≥	24.00%	25.00%	25.00%	19.00%	19.50%
A	19.00%	Data	23.53%	26.15%	25.49%	19.51%	21.28%
B	2009	Target ≥	61.00%	62.00%	62.00%	65.00%	66.00%
B	59.00%	Data	73.53%	72.31%	76.47%	65.85%	65.96%
C	2009	Target ≥	81.50%	82.00%	83.00%	73.00%	75.50%
C	80.00%	Data	82.35%	83.08%	90.20%	73.17%	82.98%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	20.00%	20.50%	21.00%	21.50%
Target B ≥	66.50%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%
Target C ≥	77.00%	78.50%	80.00%	80.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE’s progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director’s monthly meetings,

collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	81
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	39
Response Rate	48.15%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	9
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)	2
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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	9	39	21.28%	20.00%	23.08%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	28	39	65.96%	66.50%	71.79%	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	39	82.98%	77.00%	76.92%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C	<p>VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response</p> <p>The VIDE/SOSE notes the reason for the slippage for 14C are challenges associated with accessing a higher degree of real-time contact information of exiters who leave before the end of the school year and also those who leave the school at the end of the school year to participate in Post-School Outcomes (PSO) survey interviews.</p>

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	2021	2022
Response Rate	53.41%	48.15%

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

The VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis for target leavers and respondents using the VIDE/State PSO calculator using the following data elements: gender, mode of exit, and disability category for the thirty-nine responders. The VIDE/SOSE item analysis for all responders produced valuable data and displayed counts and representativeness for subgroups in each demographic category previously listed. For instance, the percentages of the respondents were as follows: From the 47 respondents, 28 fell into the SLD category for a respondent representation of 71.79% from a target leaver group of 72.83%. Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE analyzes the Post-school outcome data to determine if any underrepresentation exists (if there are any disparities of +/- 3% between the various populations, then there is an evident nonresponse bias).

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 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.

The VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis using the State PSO calculator to determine nonresponse bias on gender, graduation/exiting status, race/ethnicity, and disability category of the thirty-nine (39) responders. The SOSE item analysis for all responders produced valuable data and displayed counts and representativeness for subgroups in each demographic category. The results of the analysis are as follows: (1) Overall target leaver representation group by disability category was that of SLD with 71.79%, (b) an aggregate of target leaver representation was for these disabilities categories (AUT, ED, ID, OHI, SLI, and VI) with 27.16%.

In addition, for respondent representation, SLD accounted for 47.46% of the respondents' representation. In addition, analysis on dropout revealed 15 youth within the target group of leavers, which represents 33.33% and a total of 18.52% target leaver representation: of this, 12.82% represents the respondent representation for a -5.70 % negative difference or under-representation, denoting underrepresentation.

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

For the FFY 2022, the VIDE/SOSE collected responses from mailed and telephone surveys for 39 out of the 81 target leavers, which yielded a 48.15% response rate. The data denotes a decrease in the overall response rate compared to FFY 2021 (last year) of 5.26%. As a means of improving the response rate for all youth who are no longer in secondary school, the VIDE/SOSE will have to amplify its collaboration efforts with each Local Education Agency (LEA) to create a tool to utilize during exit IEP meetings, to aid with the collection of the additional demographic collection data. This collection activity will commence during the spring, before the end of the respective school year, with relevant data to create a student profile for prospective leavers. Relatedly, the VIDE/SOSE will encourage each LEA to explore the implementation of the youth existing profiles as a mechanism to support the coherent delivery of post-school services.

These student profiles will amplify the Districts and State's capacity to reach a wider audience by (1) accessing to the extent possible in real-time the contact information of exiters who leave before the end of the school year and profiling those Exiters who exit school at the end of the school year, and (2) all parents of a child with a disability in high school will be interviewed to capture accurate demographic information for promoting optimum post-school service delivery options. More distinctly, they will impact the VIDE/SOSE's ability to increase the response rate. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will engage its public relations division to promote the collection of these data by using its advertising campaigns and networks throughout the school calendar year.

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 conducted an item analysis using the State PSO calculator to determine nonresponse to the examination to determine the degree to which the respondents represent the target leaver representation respondents. To address this, the VIDE/SOSE conducted an item analysis using the State PSO calculator to determine nonresponse bias on gender, graduation/exiting status, race/ethnicity, and disability category of the thirty-nine (39) responders. The SOSE item analysis for all responders produced valuable data and displayed counts and representativeness for subgroups in each demographic category. The results of the analysis are as follows: (1) Overall target leaver representation group by disability category was that of SLD with 71.79%, (b) an aggregate of target leaver representation was for these disabilities categories (AUT, ED, ID, OHI, SLI, and VI) with 27.16%. In addition, for respondent representation, SLD accounted for 47.46% of the respondents' representation. In addition, the analysis revealed that (a) 16 youth within the target leavers group were dropouts, representing 19.75% target leaver representation and 14.71% representing the respondent representation for a -5.05 % negative difference or denoting underrepresentation. In addition, 71.60% represented target leaver representation, (b) 28 youth within the target group of leavers were SLD, which represents 71.60% target leaver representation and 10.75%, represents the respondent representation 10.75 % overrepresentation, (c) and less than 10 of the youth within the target group of leavers were ID, which represents -7.41% target leaver representation and -7.41%, respondent representation, implying underrepresentation.

Regarding response relative to nonresponse bias, the VIDE/SOSE is mindful that the subgroups are less likely to respond to a survey, resulting in their underrepresentation. The VIDE/SOSE notes that there are no differences between what is being measured between all subgroups, so there is no

systematic underrepresentation in the survey data. Notably, the VIDE/SOSE underrepresentation for dropouts of -5.05% was mainly due to demographic information resulting from insufficient contact data. To prevent this in future survey collection, the VIDE/SOSE will implement a track completion---data profile for underrepresented groups with targeted follow-up timelines. The VIDE/SOSE will work with the LEA to promote key groups, such as those who graduate with a certificate of completion and or drop out, to ease access, understanding, and completion of the survey to increase the response rate, which in turn increases the potential effect of post-school outcomes.

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)

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The VIDE/SOSE notes the reason for the slippage for 14C are challenges associated with accessing a higher degree of real-time contact information of exiters who leave before the end of the school year and also those who leave the school at the end of the school year to participate in Post-School Outcomes (PSO) survey interviews.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must report whether the FFY 2022 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 the Virgin Islands is taking to address this issue. The 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline 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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	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

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2008	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=				.00%	
Data		100.00%	100.00%		0.00%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE had fewer than 10 resolution sessions for the FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023) APR reporting period. Thus, the VIDE/SOSE is not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The Virgin Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ 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 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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	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

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	81.20%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=					
Data					100.00%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The VIDE/SOSE had fewer than 10 mediation sessions for the FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023) APR reporting period. Thus, the VIDE/SOSE is not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediation is less than 10.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The 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) (SiMR) 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 2022 through February 2027, 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) 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, 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, 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 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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 students 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.

The VIDE/SOSE's link to its Theory of Action is listed below.

<https://vide.vi/documents/special-education/3018-table-1-vide-theory-of-action-indicator-b17-clarification-1.html>

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	8.61%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	11.50%	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3	69	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3	69		11.50%	4.35%	Did not meet target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) Year 8 reporting of Phase III, the Virgin Islands Department of Education, State Office of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), and the Division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) are the primary data sources for all statewide assessment data for all children to include children/youth with disabilities in grades 3-8, and 11. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE collects and reviews the raw disaggregated student and

school-level data received from the division of PRE and the pre-populated data submitted via the EDFacts data platform for file specifications 175 and 178 and the data groups 583,584 and 588). Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE analyzes the data to ensure completeness, grouping proficiency levels, and tabulation of student proficiency rates on statewide assessments, explicitly English Language Arts (ELA) /reading assessments.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response Indicator B17

This indicator's VIDE/SOSE numerator is 3, and the denominator is 69.

The Virgin Islands included and provided the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data table.

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

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) Year 8 reporting of Phase III of the SSIP, the territory's statewide general assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and math (Smarter Balanced ELA and math), in this instance, ELA are administered to students in an online format except for those children/youth requiring large print or braille booklets as per their Individualized Education Program (IEP). Participation and performance data for students administered the Statewide Assessment is collected utilizing the Online Reporting System (ORS); these results are usually available for state, district, and school-level access approximately ten (10) days after the student completes their assessment (summative). Further, access to specific student-level, classroom, and school-wide data is contingent on the role of the individual (i.e., the teacher's view is restricted to the student and classroom levels. District and school leadership can access student-specific, classroom, and school-wide data. All assessment data also encompasses the disaggregation by subgroup (i.e., children/youth with disabilities).

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) Year 8 reporting of Phase III of the SSIP, the VIDE/SOSE conducted testing on statewide assessments for all students, including children with IEPs; children/ students in grades 3 through 8 and 11 were tested to determine their academic performance levels on English Language Arts/reading and math assessments. The Virgin Islands Department of Education, the State Office of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), and the Division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) remain the primary data sources for all statewide assessment data.

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

YES

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

The Virgin Islands Department of Education, District Office of Data and Assessments, and schools use the iReady adaptive diagnostic tool to ascertain the specific skill (s) each teacher must closely work with a student to enhance. The District conducts this activity at the beginning, mid-year, and end of the school year (October, January, and May). Moreover, iReady data for each student is collected and analyzed through the online dashboard, which utilizes results-specific algorithms utilizing historical and current data to identify and accelerate evidence-based instructional strategies. Based on the FFY 2022 (SY2022-23), iReady scores for children with disabilities in the third grade for District 1 are as follows: 11.1% on or above level, 77.8% 1 level below, and 11.1% 2+ levels below. District 2 scores are as follows: 11.6% on or above level, 16.7% 1 level below, 66.7% scored two levels below, and 5.6% did not take the test.

In addition, the VIDE uses the Tableau data dashboard to capture and connect various data elements. This dashboard captures relevant data to connect and identify District, school, classroom, and student-specific trends and, more specifically, needs and supports for all students, including children/youth with disabilities (i.e., attendance). To ensure consistency in addressing these issues, District and school personnel continue to engage in professional development and data chats to extract and strategically assess iReady district and school-wide performance data to support schools and teachers.

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.

The VIDE/SOSE continues to experience challenges with ongoing dialogue with its internal and external stakeholder members, namely in the review of various data points (qualitative and quantitative), to help strengthen its SSIP coherent improvement strategies aimed at improving third-grade reading performance in English Language Art Statewide/Reading assessment. However, the VIDE/SOSE commitment remains mainly to work closely with the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Development and other stakeholders to review data to identify and provide professional development that is aligned with the VI-SOS in one or more of the Priority Areas as listed (a) priority Area 1 Quality Schools (a) Strategy 1 (Effective Practice), (b) Strategy 2-Effective and Personalized Instruction, (c) Strategy 3-Callaborative School Leadership, and (d) Strategy 4 'Healthy Learning and Working Environments. For the priority area, 3 Strategy 1, family engagement opportunities are for parents/guardians to develop capabilities to support the teaching and learning process of their child(ren).

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

<https://vide.vi/documents/public-relations/3166-ssip-evaluation-plan/file.html>

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:

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), Year 8 of implementation, the VIDE/SOSE continued to identify infrastructure strategies to assist with the optimization of the collection and reporting capabilities for student-specific data at all levels to include compliance, results, and more specifically, the requirements relating to Section 616 and Section 618. Further, the VIDE/SOSE converted from one online web-based special education system, "Goalview," to "EDPlan," a new and advanced online web-based special education student management system. The EDPlan online system meets the requirements of the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), specifically, the following

processes and data collection such as referral, consent, and evaluation and development of Individualized Education Program (IEP) for children/youth found eligible for services under Part B of the Act. To ensure strategic consistency with ensuring smooth and efficient usage by each user, the VIDE/SOSE engages in weekly and bi-weekly check-in status meetings with the Public Consulting Group vendor for the EDPlan to discuss and address areas pinpointed for improvement and investigate and identify, if necessary, ways to streamline system functionality.

The VIDE/SOSE continues to ensure that all system upgrades meet the requirements of the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), specifically, the following processes and data collection such as referral, consent, and evaluation and Individualized Education Program (IEP) information. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE met weekly with the vendors of EDPlan and discussed questions and concerns, additional needs, and status updates. Further, this student management system generates, provides, and archives all 34 CFR §300.600 documents. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE hosted virtual recurrent training for each LEA, for all State Office of Special Education personnel, special education teachers, school social workers, psychologists, physical, occupational, and speech and language therapists, paraprofessionals, and EDPlan district managers.

In addition, for FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE continues to utilize the action strands within the Theory of Action to help guide its improvement strategies. For example, the VIDE/SOSE is an active VIDE Accountability Task Force member for the United States Virgin Islands Department of Education Accountability system. For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), task force members continued to examine specific measures for school and student performance relative to the proficiency performance of all students on statewide assessments. In addition, the VIDE continues to explore with the selected vendor, the possible development of an accountability workbook with the vendor, which active task force members will vet. Most importantly, the design of the VIDE's Accountability system is to ensure equity through the identified overarching goals and specific associated accountability measures to ensure a fully operationalized system that focuses on equity. Some of these goals are communicating lucid expectations, differentiation based on performance, allowing for appropriate levels of resource allocations, and a variety of accountability measures that provide a holistic image of the overall quality of each school. Moreover, one of the features of the VIDE's accountability measures is student achievement. As such, the VIDE/SOSE will work closely with the State Offices of Curriculum and Instructional Development and Assessment to collaborate on professional development opportunities for schools needing support.

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.

For FFY 2022 (2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE and its stakeholders employ various methods to measure and determine the attainment of infrastructure improvement strategies and overall systemic transformation. Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE continued to engage in cross-departmental stakeholder collaboration on various literacy initiatives, such as the COER Curriculum Council, to internally review and provide recommendations relating to standards and curriculum in specific areas, for example, those relating to career and technical education, which can serve to strengthen transition services and post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities.

Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE is working closely and has begun investigating the alignment of the different strategies within the VIDE's framework of System of Support for School Success, namely, its actions and desired outcomes outlined in its Theory of Action, which is to boost student outcomes through the amplification of overall student, school leaders, teachers, and other school personnel by providing ongoing targeted professional development, coaching, modeling, ongoing feedback, and necessary responsive supports. In addition, during FFY 2022 (SY2022-23), VIDE/SOSE continue to conduct walkthroughs to ascertain school, teacher, and student needs. In addition, the VIDE/SOSE collaborated with the State Office of Curriculum and Instructional Development in its early literacy campaign. For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE conducted parental outreach activities and provided parents with information relative to parental satisfaction data to seek input on suggestions for strategic exploration to aid with performance and improvement on English Language Arts assessment for children with disabilities with particular emphasis on third graders.

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.

Though there are some level of difficulties for the FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) Year 8 of implementation of its VIDE's SSIP, the VIDE/SOSE remains dedicated to active collaboration among various offices with the State Office of Curriculum and Instruction, District Office of Professional Development, District Office of Data & Assessment and District Offices of Special Education to leverage professional development activities that can be linked to the opportunities for instructional transformation. More specifically, those that can effectuate the use of evidence-based practices to increase simultaneously the capacity of the VIDE/SOSE's multi-tiered system of supports (RTI and PBIS). Further, the VIDE/SOSE's SSIP will continue to serve as one of the critical factors when exploring and designing professional development opportunities. As such, For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE will amplify its targeted efforts by collecting, analyzing, gauging, and measuring short and long-term outcomes, more critically, the efficacy and ongoing continuation of components within the VIDE/SOSE's Logic Models (LMs).

As reported in FFY 2021 (School Year 2021-22), the VIDE remains conscious of the need to strengthen its infrastructure and improvement strategies to improve and ultimately achieve the desired outcome(s). For this reason, for the course leading to Phase III Year 9 of implementation, FFY 2023, the VIDE/SOSE will concentrate on working closely with the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Development and Professional Learning Communities and various schools as an example, schools selected for Differentiated Supports as guided by the VIDE's. Notably, stakeholder input is a critical component of the VIDE/SOSE; thus, the VIDE/SOSE will continue with an intensive focus on reconnecting all stakeholders, particularly by introducing and, when necessary, re-familiarizing stakeholder members with the role of active members to review and utilize available data as the mechanism for driving improvement and helping drive the actualization of the VIDE/SOSE's SiMR.

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

For the FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE, through the District Office, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, began (May 2023) a series of in-person and virtual trainings to provide the teachers with the various features of the rollout of the Reading Eggs evidence-based online reading program. Pre-kindergarten through third-grade teachers throughout the districts are part of the past and current series. The design of the Reading Eggs program concentrates on five reading components. These components are phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. In addition, the VIDE/SOSE also launched professional development in the "Science of Reading" during the early portion of the 2023-24 school year. "This professional learning activity encompasses evidence-based strategies, namely structured and explicit teaching and learning. This professional development focuses on instructional practices that intensively emphasize phonological awareness, print concepts, oral and vocabulary language development and comprehension, word recognition and fluency, and phonics. These professional development activities include onsite job-embedded

coaching and virtual coaching follow-up sessions. Another evidence-based practice implemented in the FFY 2022 (School Year) covered Early Learning Instructional Planning to include varying strategies such as adequately maximizing instructional time, differentiated instruction, and standards-based instructional practices, to name a few. Educators at pre-kindergarten through 6th grade and pre-kindergarten through 8th schools participated in professional development that focused on analyzing and using data to aid with classroom instructional methods (i.e., one-on-one, small group) to meet individual student needs. Overall, the evidenced-based practices implemented for the FFY 2022(School Year 2022-23) concentrated on instructional practices to use data to identify learning gaps, employ the most suitable individualized teaching and simultaneously monitor students' progress. In addition, the VIDE launched in-person professional development for teachers, a component of the English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program. This professional development activity provided teachers with evidence-based strategies to encourage and ultimately empower students who are English language learners with the requisite skills for positive academic performance. Teachers provided these strategies through structured language teaching and learning, including individualized adaptive support for students in a culturally responsive environment and integrated lessons.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE, through its collaboration in Year 8 with the Office of Curriculum & Instructional Development in partnership with the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast and the Islands (REL-NE), early childhood teachers with evidence-based professional learning opportunities through the Joyful Learning in Early Childhood modules is developed to support early childhood professionals with the opportunity to engage in enhancement their knowledge and skills through evidence-based practices to amplify the overall classroom, and individual supports for young children, to include young children with disabilities. The design of this professional learning opportunity also encompasses a significant focus on understanding the specific skills necessary for meeting the classroom needs of young learners, more specifically, the social-emotional learning and developmental goals. As comprehensively noted in the section "List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period," all the evidence-based practices implemented for the FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), Year 8 of implementation collectively focused on heightening instructional awareness, refining current instructional to ensure alignment with that of effective use of evidence-based practices to use data to identify learning gaps, employing the most suitable individualize teaching and simultaneously monitor students' progress.

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.

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2021-22), Year 8 implementation, the VIDE/SOSE continued to support district-level professional learning activities that support effective and personalized learning, community and family engagement, and strategies to enhance teacher instructional practice that is aligned to the curriculum to ensure high levels of implementation with fidelity. Further, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to engage in various leadership and professional development academies geared towards continuous improvement for school and district leaders, children and youth, and their families. More specifically, it provides opportunities for teachers to access resources to aid with successful teaching and learning, specifically in English/Language Arts/Reading.

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

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) for Year 8 of implementation, the VIDE/SOSE used its Continuous Improvement Results Focused Monitoring System (CIRFMS), Statewide participation and proficiency level data, and iReady Data to ascertain the level of practice and program effectiveness.

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.

The VIDE/SOSE secured iReady and Statewide proficiency data for FFY (School Year 2022-23), Year 8 of implementation. The results of these data sets continue to support the need to continue not only the ongoing use of evidenced-based practice strategies (EBPs) but also the need to amplify the existing level of cross-divisional and district-level partnerships that focus on heightening the magnitude and the teacher knowledge and skills.

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

Although challenges remain, the VIDE/SOSE remains committed to heightening the level of attainment, improvements, and modifications to the infrastructure that supports the utilization of SSIP initiatives. More specifically, the VIDE/SOSE's next steps will include organizational and systemic transformations that will lend themselves to increasing the capacity of the VIDE/SOSE's multi-tiered system of supports, RtI, and PBIS Logic Models. Moreover, these models will remain the roadmap to determine the level of connectivity between the U.S. Virgin Islands System of Support for School Success (VI-SOS), particularly those strategies designed to address all students' academic and behavioral skills. The VIDE/SOSE will investigate the most suitable and effective mode or opportunities to serve as a channel for sharing information on the components of its SSIP and to seize available opportunities for inclusive planning and execution of professional development opportunities with a concentrated focus on reading strategies.

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 will continue its implementation of its SSIP, with an intensive focus and action-oriented on examining current and other partnership opportunities VIDE CORE internal stakeholders, namely, the State Office of Curriculum & Instruction, on the identification and ongoing implementation of evidence-based strategies that support the activities within the VIDE/SOSE's Logic Models.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-2023), the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform core stakeholders on the VIDE/SOSE's progress regarding specific Part B indicators, which included identified barriers and areas for improvements. The VIDE/SOSE solicited input from stakeholders regarding target setting and any revisions that may be warranted. Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned indicator clusters and are individually responsible for collecting and analyzing data and drafting responses. These stakeholders work collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager to share the current progress with internal and external stakeholders in meeting targets. The VIDE/SOSE engages stakeholders in establishing or revising targets for each indicator.

VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response

The mechanisms used by the Virgin Islands for soliciting broad stakeholder input are quarterly meetings, district director's monthly meetings, collaborative parent meetings, grade-level and content expert meetings, community parent outreach activities, early childhood personnel collaborative district meetings, District Office of Special Education and Educational Diagnostic Center technical assistance meetings, interagency partner meeting and linking agencies collaborative meetings. In addition, the Virgin Islands, through its Public Relations Divisions, engage in activities to share ongoing information relating to special education with the entire populace. Moreover, the Virgin Islands support and participate in the District Office of Special Education parental informational "meet and greet" workshops to share information and provide relevant updates on the VIDE's SPP/APR and other pertinent IDEA-related services. Attendance at these parental sessions includes parents of children and youth from various subgroups (i.e., special needs, ELs, racial/ethnic groups). These activities intend to strengthen and engage the Virgin Islands' capacity for diverse groups of parents.

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

During FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) Year 9 implementation, the VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to dialogue and inform stakeholders on the components of the VIDE/SOSE's SSIP share progress, identified barriers and areas, seek suggestions on areas for improvement as well as the need to continue to engage its stakeholders.

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

NO

Additional Implementation Activities

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

For FFY 2023 (School Year 2023-24), the VIDE/SOSE has no newly described activities to be implemented for the reporting FFY 2022. (School Year 2022/23). Thus, for FFY 2023 (School Year 2023-24), Year 9 of implementation, the VIDE/SOSE will continue with the activities included in Table D, submitted in April 2020.

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

For FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23), the VIDE/SOSE has not identified any new activities related to its SiMR.

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

Notably, for FFY 2022 (School Year 2022-23) Year 8 reporting, the VIDE/SOSE has been able to overcome some barriers by developing a solid professional development plan. Moreover, there is a linkage between the VIDE/SOSE's SSIP and the VI-SOSE. Thus, The VIDE/SOSE remains optimistic relative to the positive benefits of the recently crafted and adopted United States Virgin Islands System of Support for School Success (VI-SOS). The VI-SOS is closely aligned with VIDE's accountability measures and provides a blueprint that includes priority areas, goals, and targets with student achievement at the forefront. More importantly, because of the system's embedded collaboration, it can serve as a channel to address any evident barriers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The Virgin Islands did not, as required by the Measurement Table, provide: (1) FFY 2021 data for this indicator, and (2) the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data table.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must report all required data and components in this indicator. Reporting data under this indicator is critical so that the Virgin Islands, OSEP and the public can determine the Virgin Island's performance and whether and how the Virgin Islands met its targets for this indicator. OSEP may consider taking additional actions if the Virgin Islands is unable to report the required data in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As per OSEP's required actions and the requirements of the Measurable Table, the VIDE/SOSE provided the following: (1) FFY 2021 data for this indicator, and (2) the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data table.

17 - OSEP Response

Virgin Islands did not provide the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data table.

17 - Required Actions

The Virgin Islands did not provide the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data table. The Virgin Islands must provide the required numerator and denominator descriptions for FFY 2023 in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

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

Email:

renee.charleswell@vide.vi

Phone:

340-774-0100

Submitted on:

04/24/24 12:47:14 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

US Virgin Islands

2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
73.33%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	6	2	33.33%
Compliance	18	18	100.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education, Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 3-8	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 3-8	96%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	N/A	N/A

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years	24	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years**	60	0

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	100.00%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	100.00%	N/A	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	97.62%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric
US Virgin Islands

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	0	1	2
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	20
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	24.76

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	24.76
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	50.76
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	0.9762
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	97.62

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

US Virgin Islands

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	1
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	1
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	0
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	1
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	0
(2.1) Mediations held.	0
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	0

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	0
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	0
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	0

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	0
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	0
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

US Virgin Islands

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Dionne Wells-Hedrington
Commissioner
Virgin Islands Department of Education
1834 Kongens Gade
St. Thomas, VI 00802

Dear Commissioner Wells-Hedrington:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that U.S. Virgin Islands needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of U.S. Virgin Islands' data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

U.S. Virgin Islands' 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Freely Associated States, Outlying Areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education-Part B" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations for outlying areas, freely associated States and the Bureau of Indian Education (the Entities) in 2024, as it did for determinations in 2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for U.S. Virgin Islands).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of U.S. Virgin Islands' SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your U.S. Virgin Islands-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access U.S. Virgin Islands' SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that U.S. Virgin Islands is required to take. The actions that U.S. Virgin Islands is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) U.S. Virgin Islands' RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated U.S. Virgin Islands' "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the U.S. Virgin Islands' "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, U.S. Virgin Islands' 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

U.S. Virgin Islands' determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising U.S. Virgin Islands of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\)](#) | [OSEP Ideas That Work](#), [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring U.S. Virgin Islands to work with appropriate entities. In addition, U.S. Virgin Islands should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs U.S. Virgin Islands 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. We strongly encourage U.S. Virgin Islands to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. U.S. Virgin Islands must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which U.S. Virgin Islands received assistance; and
- (2) the actions U.S. Virgin Islands took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. §300.606, U.S. Virgin Islands must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, the U.S. Virgin Islands must report annually to the public, by posting on its agency website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the U.S. Virgin Islands on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the U.S. Virgin Islands' submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, the U.S. Virgin Islands must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the U.S. Virgin Islands' SPP/APR;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (2) determine if each LEA “meets the requirements” of Part B, or “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention” in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, the U.S. Virgin Islands must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on its agency’s website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing an Entity Profile that:

- (1) includes U.S. Virgin Islands' determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates U.S. Virgin Islands' efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with U.S. Virgin Islands over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: U.S. Virgin Islands Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education’s mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.