

Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table

Part B SPP/APR Indicators

1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]
3. Statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator] B. Participation rate for children with IEPs on statewide assessments. [Results Indicator] C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; [Results Indicator] B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator]
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator]
7. Percent of preschool children age 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. [Results Indicator]
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]

10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]
11. 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. [Compliance Indicator]
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]
13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. [Compliance Indicator]
14. 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. [Results Indicator]
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. [Compliance Indicator]
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]

Timeliness of State Complaint and Due Process Hearing Decisions
(Collected as Part of IDEA Section 618 Data rather than through an SPP/APR Indicator)

Timely Resolution of State Complaints: 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

Timely Adjudication of Due Process Hearing Requests: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Results Data Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET
1. Graduation	37.4%	30.26%	≥ 24% ¹
2. Drop Out	4.6%	9.79%	≤ 3% ²
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup	0%	0%	0%
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading	97.4%	98.83%	≥ 95%
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Math	97.4%	98.83%	≥ 95%
C. Proficiency Rate - Reading	24.12%	20.29%	≥ 54.5%
C. Proficiency Rate- Math	32.58%	28.05%	≥ 52.9%
4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	50%	0%	≤ 50%
5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21			
A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day	51.86%	55.24%	≥ 47%
B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day	19.47%	17.45%	≤ 22%
C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals	4.35%	3.44%	≤ 3%
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending:			
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program;		92.5%	Baseline
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		1.24%	Baseline
7. Preschool Outcomes	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement	83.68%	80.71%	≥ 82%
14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:			
A. Enrolled in Higher Education	13.8%	6.59%	≥ 20%
B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed	37.5%	50.55%	≥ 60%
C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment	36.1%	71.43%	≥ 80%

¹ As used in this table, the symbol “≥” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be greater than or equal to the established target.

² As used in this table, the symbol “≤” means that, to meet the target, the State’s data must be less than or equal to the established target.

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET
18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	All six resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.	Four of five resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.	Not Applicable
19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	All four mediations resulted in mediation agreements.	The one mediation resulted in a mediation agreement.	Not Applicable

7. Percent of Preschool Children Age 3 through 5 with IEPs Who Demonstrate Improved Outcomes

Summary Statement 1³	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2011 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	79.3%	77.87%	≥ 46.40%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	77.1%	69.81%	≥ 47.93%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	91.5%	84.31%	≥ 58.64%
Summary Statement 2⁴	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2011 Data	FFY 2011 Target
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	68.4%	37.97%	≥ 33.70%
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)	71.4%	39.24%	≥ 28.62%
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	87.8%	37.97%	≥ 42.18%

³ **Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered or exited 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.

⁴ **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.

Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2011 Results Data Summary Notes

<p>INDICATOR 1: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 2: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 3A: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State has not applied for a flexibility waiver under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The State is reporting AYP data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 3B: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 3C: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2011 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>
<p>INDICATOR 4A: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 2012 FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to submit: (1) documentation regarding the review of district policies, procedures and practices as required by 34 CFR §300.170 for the district identified with significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 data; (2) a description of the State’s monitoring procedures for this indicator, including the timeline the State uses in its monitoring procedures; (3) any updated information regarding the steps that the State has taken to ensure timely identification of noncompliance for this indicator; (4) copies of monitoring reports or other written findings issued for this indicator during FFY 2010; and (5) monitoring reports or other written findings issued for this indicator during FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State reported on page 24 of its FFY 2011 APR that it did not, as reported in its FFY 2010 APR, identify noncompliance in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2009 data for this indicator. The State reported that finding of noncompliance was related to Indicator 4B. The State reported in its FFY 2010 APR that: (1) it identified one district with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs based on FFY 2009 data; (2) reviewed that district’s policies, procedures and practices as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b); and (3) did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>In its September 10, 2012 and October 15, 2012 letters, the State provided: (1) a description of its monitoring procedures and timelines used for this indicator; (2) a description of the revisions made to its monitoring system to address the timely identification of noncompliance and tracking of correction; and (3) copies of monitoring reports issued during FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p>

INDICATOR 5: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.
INDICATOR 6: The State provided FFY 2011 baseline data, targets for FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2012.
INDICATOR 7: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. REQUIRED ACTIONS The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2012 in the FFY 2012 APR.
INDICATOR 8: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.
INDICATOR 14: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.
INDICATOR 18: The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2011. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolutions were held.
INDICATOR 19: The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2011. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2011 SPP/APR Compliance Summary

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010
4B. Significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements	0%	0%	0%	The State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010. (See Compliance Data Summary Notes.)
9. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010.
10. Disproportionate representation by disability of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	0%	0%	0%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010.
11. Timely Initial Evaluation	100%	100%	100%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010.
12. Early Childhood Transition	100%	100%	100%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2010.
13. Secondary Transition	97.7%	37.28%	100%	The State reported that none of the 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.
15. Timely Correction	100%	0%	100%	The State reported that none of the 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner.

INDICATOR	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2011 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2010
20. Timely and Accurate Data	89.85%	95.55%	100%	

Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2011 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports

REQUIREMENT	FFY 2010 DATA	FFY 2011 DATA
Timely resolution of complaints	The State reported that it did not issue any signed written complaints during the reporting period.	The State reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the reporting period.
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	0% (based on two due process hearings)	100% (based on one due process hearing)

Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2011 Compliance Data Summary Notes

INDICATOR 4B: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.

The State reported that one of two districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in any race/ethnicity category.

OSEP’s June 2012 FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to submit: (1) documentation regarding the review of district policies, procedures and practices as required by 34 CFR §300.170 for the district identified with significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 data; (2) a description of the State’s monitoring procedures for this indicator including the timeline the State uses in its monitoring procedures; (3) any updated information regarding the steps that the State has taken to ensure timely identification and verification of correction of noncompliance for this indicator; (4) copies of monitoring reports or other written findings issued for this indicator during FFY 2010; and (5) monitoring reports or other written findings issued for this indicator during FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.

The State reported on page 33 of its FFY 2011 APR that, on February 6, 2012, it identified a finding of noncompliance under this indicator based on 2008-2009 data. The State reported on page 33 of its FFY 2011 APR that it considers “the finding issued on February 6, 2012, although based on 2008-2009 data, as a FFY 2010 finding.” However, as noted in OSEP’s Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting On Correction in the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) dated September 3, 2008, a finding is considered identified on the date on which the State provides written notification to the LEA of the noncompliance. As such, OSEP considers this a finding identified in FFY 2011.

In its September 10, 2012 and October 15, 2012 letters, the State provided: (1) information regarding the review of policies, procedures and practices for the district identified with significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 data; (2) a description of its monitoring procedures and timelines used for this indicator; (3) a description of the revisions made to its monitoring system to address the timely identification of noncompliance and tracking of correction; (4) copies of written findings issued for this indicator for FFY 2011; and (5) monitoring reports issued during FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.

INDICATOR 4B:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (on February 6, 2012) for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2012 APR, that the district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2011, based on 2008-2009 data, has corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.⁵ In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 9: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that two of two districts excluded “some racial and ethnic groups” that did not meet the meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in the same racial and ethnic group.

INDICATOR 10: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

The State reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that two of two districts excluded “some specific disability categories in racial and ethnic groups” that did not meet the meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in a specific disability category who are of the same racial and ethnic group.

INDICATOR 11: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

⁵ OSEP Memorandum 09-02 (OSEP Memo 09-02), dated October 17, 2008, requires that the State report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

INDICATOR 13: The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2011, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate in the FFY 2012 APR that the remaining 11 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2010 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2012 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 and each LEA with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 15:

OSEP notes that the State reported that none of the 12 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected in a timely manner. As noted under the Compliance Data Summary Notes for Indicator 4B, the finding of noncompliance for Indicator 4B was identified in FFY 2011, not FFY 2010.

OSEP's June 2012 FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to submit a listing of the materials, documents, and information VIDE reviewed in its efforts to identify the remaining uncorrected FFY 2008 findings, and any updated information regarding the steps that the State has taken to identify the findings and verify correction of noncompliance for the remaining uncorrected FFY 2008 findings previously reported in the FFY 2009 APR. In addition, for FFY 2009, FFY 2010, and FFY 2011, respectively, the State was required to submit: (1) documentation regarding the State's past monitoring schedules and activities; (2) a description of how the State monitored for all Part B requirements, including information demonstrating that the State has ensured that the data collected from its monitoring activities were timely analyzed to determine if noncompliance existed and that findings were issued within three months of the monitoring activity or data collection; (3) documentation demonstrating that monitoring reports and other written findings were issued to districts in a timely manner; and (4) documentation demonstrating that the State has tracked and is tracking findings of noncompliance to ensure verification of correction within one year from the issuance of the finding.

On page 109 of its FFY 2011 APR, the State submitted a listing of the materials, documents, and information VIDE reviewed in its efforts to identify the remaining uncorrected FFY 2008 findings, and provided updated information regarding the steps that the State has taken to identify the findings and verify correction of noncompliance for the remaining uncorrected FFY 2008 findings previously reported in the FFY 2009 APR. The State reported it was able to track the remaining 20 finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and verify that each finding was corrected in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. On pages 105 and 108 of its FFY 2011 APR, VIDE reported that with assistance from its technical assistance providers, during FFY 2011 it developed a new integrated monitoring system. The first component is compliance indicator monitoring, which was piloted in both districts in September 2012. The second component of the monitoring system is results-focused cyclical monitoring.

In its September 10, 2012 and October 15, 2012 letters, the State provided the following documentation: (1) information regarding monitoring schedules and timelines for FFY 2009, FFY 2010, and FFY 2011; (2) a description of its revised general supervision system for FFY 2012; and (3) written notification of findings that were issued to districts after monitoring activities. OSEP notes that two of the written findings issued, which related to LEA noncompliance with the timely evaluation requirements, were dated one year after the monitoring activity. In addition, on June 2nd, 2013, VIDE submitted supplemental information in response to its FFY 2010 Response Table. This submission included: (1) a focused monitoring report issued on May 13, 2013; (2) a revised compliance indicator monitoring report dated May 16, 2013; (3) correspondence to LEA superintendents regarding the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for Indicator 13; (4) monitoring reports regarding the provision of related services; and (5) a district corrective action plan dated May 19, 2009.

INDICATOR 15:

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2012 APR, that the remaining 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2011 APR were corrected.

When reporting in the FFY 2012 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 and FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2012 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must use and submit the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

Further, in responding to Indicator 13 in the FFY 2012 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under that indicator.

With its FFY 2012 APR, VIDE must submit documentation that demonstrates it has implemented its revised general supervision system. Documentation must include: (1) information demonstrating that the State has ensured that the data collected from its monitoring activities were timely analyzed to determine if noncompliance existed and that monitoring reports and other written findings were issued to districts within three months of the monitoring activity or data collection; (2) information demonstrating that the State has tracked and is tracking findings of noncompliance to ensure verification of correction is completed within one year from the issuance of the finding; and (3) copies of monitoring reports issued during FFY 2012 and FFY 2013.

PUBLIC REPORTING: As noted in OSEP's June 2012 FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table, while the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2009 (July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports do not contain all of the required information. Specifically, the State has not reported on the FFY 2009 performance of each LEA on the targets in the SPP for Indicator 3.

REQUIRED ACTIONS

The State must include in its FFY 2012 APR confirmation that it has completed public reporting on the FFY 2009 performance of each LEA for Indicator 3.