

## Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2012 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 2012 SPP/APR Results Data Summary**

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 TARGET</b>
1. Graduation	30.26%	43.8%	≥ 26% <sup>1</sup>
2. Drop Out	9.79%	8.6%	≤ 3% <sup>2</sup>
3. A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup	0%	0%	≥ 50%
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading	98.83%	97.67%	≥ 95%
B. Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Math	98.83%	97.76%	≥ 95%
C. Proficiency Rate - Reading	20.29%	21.95%	≥ 54.5%
C. Proficiency Rate - Math	28.05%	27.83%	≥ 52.9%
4. A. Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	0%	100%	≤ 50%
5. Educational Environment for Children with IEPs 6-21			
A. In Regular Education 80% or More of Day	55.24%	61.35 %	≥ 48%
B. In Regular Education Less than 40% of Day	17.45%	17.14%	≤ 21%
C. In Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospitals	3.44%	4.2%	≤ 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%	92.05%	≥ 93%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.	1.24%	1.32%	≤ 1.19%
7. Preschool Outcomes	See Attached Table	See Attached Table	See Attached Table
8. Parents Reporting Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement	80.71%	83.02%	≥ 82%
14. Percent of Youth No Longer in School, within One Year of Leaving High School:			
A. Enrolled in Higher Education	6.59%	22.05%	≥ 22%
B. Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed	50.55%	50.39%	≥ 60%
C. Enrolled in Higher Education or Other Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment	71.43%	73.23%	≥ 81%

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 TARGET</b>
18. Hearing Requests Resolved through Resolution Session Agreements	Four of five resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.	All four resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.	Not applicable
19. Mediations Held that Resulted in Mediation Agreements	The one mediation resulted in a mediation agreement.	The three mediations resulted in mediation agreements.	Not applicable

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

<b>Summary Statement 1<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>FFY 2011 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Target</b>
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	77.87%	77.78%	≥ 46.40%
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	69.81%	67.07%	≥ 47.93%
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	84.31%	77.63%	≥ 58.64%
<b>Summary Statement 2<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>FFY 2011 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2012 Target</b>
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	37.97%	46.02%	≥ 33.70%
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	39.24%	31.86%	≥ 28.62%
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	37.97%	38.05%	≥ 42.18%

<sup>3</sup> **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.

<sup>4</sup> **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 FFY 2012 Results Data Summary Notes**

INDICATOR 3A: The State has not applied for, or not yet received approval for, a flexibility waiver under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The State is reporting AYP data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA.

INDICATOR 3B: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 3C: The State provided a Web link to 2012 publicly-reported assessment results.

INDICATOR 4A: The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that two 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.

The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.

The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012. The State identified noncompliance through this review.

The State did not report on the result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), i.e., the State did not report whether it revised (or required the affected district to revise), the district’s 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 compliance with the IDEA for the district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012.

The State reported on page 28 of the FFY 2012 APR that it did not issue a “new finding” to one district identified in FFY 2012, based on FFY 2011 data, as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, and practices related to the implementation of IEPs that do not comply with IDEA. The State reported it did not issue a new finding of noncompliance because it had previously issued a finding of noncompliance related to this issue and considered this noncompliance a continuation of the previously identified noncompliance. However, the State reported on pages 29 and 30 that it did not issue any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011, FFY 2010, FFY 2009 or earlier as a result of the review conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170. Therefore, OSEP is not able to determine when the State identified the finding of noncompliance.

#### **REQUIRED ACTIONS**

The State did not report the results of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected district to revise 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 compliance with the IDEA for the district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2012.

In its FFY 2013 APR, the State must report: (1) the date the finding of noncompliance was identified; and (2) on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State: (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.<sup>5</sup> In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

---

<sup>5</sup> 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)

INDICATOR 7:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

INDICATOR 18: The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

INDICATOR 19: The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

---

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.

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2012 SPP/APR Compliance Summary**

<b>INDICATOR</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 TARGET</b>	<b>CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011</b>
4B. Significant disproportionality 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%	50%	0%	The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 was not corrected.
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 2011.
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 2011.
11. Timely Initial Evaluation	100%	99.1%	100%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
12. Early Childhood Transition	100%	100%	100%	The State reported that it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2011.
13. Secondary Transition	37.28%	62.26%	100%	The State reported that none of the 175 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner, and none of those findings were subsequently corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.

INDICATOR	FFY 2011 DATA	FFY 2012 DATA	FFY 2012 TARGET	CORRECTION OF FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011
15. Timely Correction	0%	0%	100%	The State reported that none of the 176 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 were corrected in a timely manner, and none of those findings were subsequently corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.
20. Timely and Accurate Data	95.55%	95.45%	100%	

**Virgin Islands Part B FFY 2012 State Complaint and Hearing Data from IDEA Section 618 Data Reports**

<b>REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>FFY 2011 DATA</b>	<b>FFY 2012 DATA</b>
Timely resolution of complaints	The State reported that it did not receive any signed written complaints during the reporting period.	100% (based on two complaints)
Timely adjudication of due process hearing requests	100% (based on one due process hearing)	100% (based on one due process hearing)

## Virgin Islands FFY 2012 Compliance Data Summary Notes

### INDICATOR 4B:

The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”

The State reported that two 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 it reviewed the districts’ 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2011. The State also reported that one district was identified as having 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.

The State reported that both districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in any race/ethnicity category.

The State reported that it identified noncompliance with the district’s practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The State did not report on whether it revised (or required the affected district to revise), pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), the district’s practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2012.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, based on 2008-2009 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was not corrected.

The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance. The State also reported that it did not identify any new findings of noncompliance in FFY 2012 for the one district identified in FFY 2012, based on FFY 2011 data, as having 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 practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards that do not comply with IDEA. The State reported it did not issue a new finding of noncompliance because the “noncompliance was treated as ongoing and as part of the FFY 2011 finding.”

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

The State did not report on whether it revised (or required the affected district to revise) practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b). In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected district to revise practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2012.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 (based on 2008-2009 data) as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), and continuing in FFY 2012, was not corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2011 and continuing in FFY 2012 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. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**INDICATOR 9:**

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 both districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity.

**INDICATOR 10:**

The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”

The State reported that both districts met the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in a specific disability category who are of the same racial ethnic group.

INDICATOR 11:

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

INDICATOR 13:

The State reported that none of the 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2012, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2013 APR, that the remaining 175 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, and the remaining 11 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2013 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 and each LEA with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 and 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 2013 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**INDICATOR 15:**

The State reported that none of the 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.

OSEP's FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to include in the FFY 2012 APR: (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. The State did not include the required documentation with its FFY 2012 APR. However, on February 25, 2014, the State submitted: (1) a results focused monitoring report issued in FFY 2012 and an accompanying tracking chart; (2) compliance monitoring reports issued during FFY 2013; (3) a description of the continuous improvement and focused monitoring system; and (4) memoranda to districts describing the monitoring process. Based on its review of these documents, OSEP has concluded that the State provided: (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. On page 122 of the FFY 2012 APR, the State reported that staff have been assigned to regularly (quarterly) verify correction of identified findings associated with results monitoring activities and other regular data checks (i.e., updated IEPs, triennial evaluations, any corrective action plans that remain active.)

**REQUIRED ACTIONS**

The State must report, with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, that it has corrected the remaining 176 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011, and 11 findings identified in FFY 2010 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2012 APR. When reporting with the FFY 2013 APR on the correction of the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 and FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with remaining findings of 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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, with the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.

In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 11, and 13 in the FFY 2013 SPP/APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

**OTHER COMPLIANCE ISSUES:**

OSEP's FFY 2011 SPP/APR Response Table required the State to include in the FFY 2012 APR confirmation that it has completed public reporting on the FFY 2009 performance of each LEA for Indicator 3. The State provided the required information.

**High-Risk Designation:** Under the authority of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations, 34 CFR §80.12, the Department has designated the Virgin Islands as a "high-risk" grantee due to problems with Virgin Islands' fiscal accountability measures and management practices and controls. Special Conditions have been imposed on all grants awarded to Virgin Islands by the Department for FFYs 2005 through 2013.