

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State accepted OSEP’s recalculation of its FFY 2005 data and revised the targets for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 7.29%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 5.33%. The State met its revised FFY 2006 target of 6%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data consistent with the approved target for this indicator (i.e., dividing the number of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma by the total number of youth [with and without IEPs] graduating with a regular diploma). The State provided the required data.  OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 10.51%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 10.91%.  The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 9%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts this revision.  The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90%.  These data are not valid or reliable because they are not consistent with other information provided to OSEP. During OSEP’s November 2007 verification visit and in the FFY 2006 APR, VIDE reported that it does not disaggregate the data to</p>	<p>The State must provide valid and reliable data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.  OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. OSEP will</p>

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>report the participation of students with disabilities with and without accommodations and that it does not have an alternate assessment. However, in Table 6, VIDE reported that 96 students with disabilities participated in the alternate assessment scored against alternate achievement standards for both math and reading.</p> <p>Based on the section 618 data provided, OSEP recalculated the data to be 85.5%. OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State’s reported data are not valid and reliable.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 95%.</p> <p><u>Special Conditions</u></p> <p>The State did not provide all the information required by the FFY 2007 Special Conditions related to reporting publicly and to the Secretary on the participation of children with disabilities on Territory-wide assessments (and district-wide assessments) with and without accommodations and on alternate assessments, as required by 20 U.S.C. §1412(a)(16)(D) and 34 CFR §300.160. On March 27, 2008, the VI submitted a letter indicating that public reporting on assessment is posted on its website; that the alternate assessment (VITAL-A) is undergoing peer review; and that the “results of students with IEPs participating in the VITAL-A will be reported with the general VITAL report.” The report cards on the website did not disaggregate the numbers of students with disabilities taking the regular assessment with and without accommodations. Although the report included a statement that “[a]lternate assessment scores based on alternate assessment achievement standards are incorporated in the report card” OSEP was unable to locate participation rates disaggregated for the alternate assessment.</p> <p>The State did not provide new data or information regarding district-wide assessments.</p>	<p>respond on the status of the Special Conditions under separate cover.</p>

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not report valid and reliable data for this indicator. The State’s reported data did not reflect the correct measurement for this indicator. During OSEP’s November 2007 verification visit and in its FFY 2006 APR, VIDE reported that it did not yet have an alternate assessment. In Table 6, VIDE reported on performance levels of 96 students with disabilities who participated in the alternate assessment scored against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p><u>Special Conditions</u></p> <p>The State did not provide all the information required by the FFY 2007 Special Conditions on reporting publicly and to the Secretary on the performance of children with disabilities on Territory-wide assessments (and district-wide assessments) with and without accommodations and on alternate assessments, as required by 20 U.S.C. §1412(a)(16)(D) and 34 CFR §300.160. On March 27, 2008, the VI submitted a letter indicating that public reporting on assessment is posted on its website, that the alternate assessment (VITAL-A) is undergoing peer review and that the “results of students with IEPs participating in the VITAL-A will be reported with the general VITAL report.” OSEP confirmed that report cards for 2006-2007 included the performance of students with disabilities on the regular assessment. Although the report cards included a statement that “[a]lternate assessment scores based on alternate assessment achievement standards are incorporated in the report card” OSEP was unable to locate disaggregated performance data for the alternate assessment.</p> <p>The State did not provide new data or information regarding district-wide assessments.</p>	<p>The State must provide valid and reliable data for this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. OSEP will respond on the status of the Special Conditions under separate cover.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP could not determine whether these data represent progress or slippage from the FFY 2005 data that were based on a different calculation. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a definition of significant discrepancy; a determination whether there is a significant discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities; and if applicable, report on its</p>

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>												
<p>than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]</p>		<p>review, and if appropriate revision (or the affected LEA's revision) to policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p>												
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:  B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.  [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>													
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:  A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;  B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or  C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1149 1226 1502"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>40.6%</td> <td>34.87%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>32%</td> <td>26.12%</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	40.6%	34.87%	33%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	32%	26.12%	21%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target											
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	40.6%	34.87%	33%											
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	32%	26.12%	21%											

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 199 894 367">C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="894 199 999 367">3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="999 199 1119 367">3%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1119 199 1224 367">3%</td> </tr> </table>				C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3%	3%	3%													
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3%	3%	3%																		
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1003 940 1179">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="940 1003 1060 1179">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1060 1003 1180 1179">Knowledge &amp; Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1180 1003 1299 1179">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1179 940 1247">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="940 1179 1060 1247">17%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1179 1180 1247">16%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1179 1299 1247">18.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1247 940 1414">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="940 1247 1060 1414">42%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1247 1180 1414">6%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1247 1299 1414">28.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1414 940 1516">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="940 1414 1060 1516">13%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1060 1414 1180 1516">35%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1180 1414 1299 1516">8.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	17%	16%	18.5%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	42%	6%	28.5%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not	13%	35%	8.6%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, clarification that it adequately addressed those preschool students not served by the Head Start program. The State did not provide the required clarification.</p> <p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. It is unclear to OSEP whether the State's plan to collect and report data for this indicator will result in the State's ability to provide valid and reliable baseline data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. OSEP is available to provide technical assistance.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																		
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	17%	16%	18.5%																		
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	42%	6%	28.5%																		
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not	13%	35%	8.6%																		

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	reach it.				
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	27%	39%	40%	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	0%	3%	4.3%	
	The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.				
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State established baseline data and revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 baseline data for this indicator are 76%. OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage because the data submitted in FFY 2005 were not appropriate or comparable.</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a sampling plan for approval. The State reported that it is collecting census data to report on this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve data collection on performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State did not report the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State determined whether the districts were in compliance with 34 CFR §§300.304 through 300.311, but did not address the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.303.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage, or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine if LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data for FFY 2005 and 2006 that identified which groups had disproportionate representation and whether it was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination.</p> <p>The State did not provide the required data and information for FFY 2005 or FFY 2006 and must do so in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State also must describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data and those based on FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements</p>

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 311 because the State did not submit revised FFY 2005 data.	of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its definition of disproportionate representation for this indicator and OSEP accepts the revision.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State did not report the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2006 and FFY 2005 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. In addition, the State’s calculations contained numerous errors.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State identified that both districts had disproportionate representation of Hispanic students in specific disability categories, but did not determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification for FFY 2006.</li> <li>• The State did not describe how it determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification under this indicator (e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures) for FFY 2006.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p> <p>OSEP could not determine if LEAs identified in FFY 2005 as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311 because the State did not submit revised FFY 2005 data.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to identify in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, which groups, if any, had disproportionate representation and whether it was the result of inappropriate identification, and describe how the State made that determination. The State did not submit the required data and information for FFY 2005 or FFY 2006 and must do so in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State also must describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data and those based on FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 21%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 1.2%.</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations</p>

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State did not report on the timely correction of prior findings of noncompliance related to this indicator (identified in FFY 2005). Instead, the State reported on the total number of findings corrected within one year for both initial evaluations and reevaluations.</p>	<p>requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 81.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 60%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%. The State did not report on the timely correction of prior findings of noncompliance related to this indicator (identified in FFY 2005). <u>Special Conditions</u> On March 27, 2008, the VI submitted a report under the FFY 2007 Special Conditions, which required that by February 1, 2008, the VI report accurate and complete data for each LEA demonstrating compliance with the transition requirements (20 U.S.C. §1412(a)(9) and 34 CFR §300.124) for each child with a disability transitioning from Part C to Part B for the period from July 1, 2007- January 15, 2008 (born between July 1, 2004 and January 15, 2005), including the child’s name or identifier, the date of birth, the date of the transition meeting, the date the child was determined eligible or ineligible for Part B services, the date of the IEP, and the date that services began or that services were refused by the parent. The VI reported that only ten students transitioned from Part C to Part B during the reporting period. Of the ten students listed, one student was reported as “34 CFR §300.301(d)—Exception for parent noncompliance.” Although</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected. OSEP will respond on the status of the Special Conditions under separate cover. The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>



**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>the VI appears to be reporting full compliance for the reporting period, OSEP was informed that there are at least two other students who were referred for transition from Part C to Part B during the reporting period, but who are not included in report. The section 618 child count data for two-year olds served under Part C in the Fall of 2006, was 56 students.</p>	
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 45.97%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 20%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not report on the timely correction of prior findings of noncompliance related to this indicator (identified in FFY 2005).</p>	<p>OSEP could not determine whether noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that this noncompliance was corrected in a timely manner, or if not corrected in a timely manner, when the noncompliance was corrected. OSEP will respond on the status of the Special Conditions under separate cover.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 72%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, definitions for competitive employment and postsecondary school, baseline data and targets. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 70.58%. However, based on the raw data reported in the FFY 2006 APR Tables A.3 and A.4, OSEP recalculated the FFY 2006 data as 78.38%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 64.29%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 58 of 74 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining findings were corrected by December 2007. The State reported that all noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2003 and FFY 2004 were corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data demonstrating correction of all noncompliance identified in FFY 2003 and FFY 2004, and report on the timely correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87.5%. These data are based on eight complaints. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 28.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.6%. These data are based on three fully adjudicated due process hearings. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 66.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no resolution sessions were held during this reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that seven of seven mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.6%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 82.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 200 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>