STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY 2020

US Virgin Islands

PART C DUE
February 1, 2022

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers Program (VI-ITP), Part C of IDEA, is an early intervention program that serves infants and toddlers with established conditions and developmental delays, birth to three. The VI-ITP serves the districts of St. Thomas/St. John and Water Island, and the district of St. Croix. The average caseload of the two districts is 200 children. The ITP offers case management services to assist and enable an infant or toddler with a disability and their family to receive their services and know their rights, coordinates evaluations and assessments, facilitates the development, review, and evaluation of IFSPs, and serves as the single point of contact in assisting parents of infants and toddlers in obtaining access to needed early intervention services. The early intervention services offered by the VI-ITP are free of charge to the family. Technical assistance is provided to the VI-ITP by a team of professionals representing the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center), and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) who are experienced in IDEA requirements and compliance mandates.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers Program (ITP) consists of two districts: St Thomas/St John and St Croix. VI ITP has policies and procedures in place to ensure that IDEA requirements are met, and the processes which enable the program to identify and correct non-compliance are implemented. The VI Infants and Toddlers Program Director notifies the early intervention personnel of any non-compliance areas and meets with all personnel to convey the areas of noncompliance and improvement and any corrections needed. To verify correction of noncompliance for individual children, the Virgin Islands reviews each child's record for whom non-compliance was identified to ensure that correction was made (e.g., transition steps are added to the child's IFSP). Individual child records for whom non-compliance was identified are also reviewed to ensure that the child had an evaluation and assessment, IFSP developed, received the services, or had a transition conference, although it was not timely. The Service Coordinators review additional child records to ensure that the districts are still in compliance and have met subsequent children's timelines. The Infants & Toddlers Program as of December 2021 has filled the position of the Program Director. The new Program Director will set up a schedule to discuss the findings with the individual Service Coordinators in each district. In this manner, the VI Infants and Toddlers Program ensures that the districts are currently implementing the statutory/regulatory requirements.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

The ITP received technical assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center) and the DaSy Center State Liason. The TA's in these centers are experienced in IDEA requirements and compliance and assisted the ITP. As a result of COVID-19, some initiatives for provider training have been put on hold until there is a greater understanding of moving forward. There was input from the TA Centers in developing this APR/SSIP. The TA Centers assisted the ITP in improving the database used to provide the information for all federal reports submitted including this APR. Comments from families of children enrolled in the ITP were collected through family survey responses.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The ITP staff is committed, experienced, and dedicated to improving infants' and toddlers' lives in the Virgin Islands. Monthly provider meetings are conducted to allow providers to seek assistance regarding any challenging issues and provides the staff an opportunity to share strategies and experiences. Other professional development opportunities include webinars from the ECTA centers and a weekly newsletter from himama based in Canada. These newsletters have provided valuable strategies as we continue to experience the impact of COVID-19. Both St. Thomas and St. Croix districts have part-time staff who work for both Preschool Special Education and the Infants and Toddlers Program. Therefore they will benefit from professional development training from both the DOE and the Infants and Toddlers Program once there is less health threat due to COVID-19. The Program Director with the assistance of the VI-ICC and the Service Coordinators will develop a quarterly training schedule for the Providers. There remain continued challenges regarding recruiting and retaining early intervention providers of OT, PT, and S/LP. The ITP Providers are committed, dedicated, and experienced in early intervention services. There is good communication and informal networking among the staff.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

Apply stakeholder input from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

4

Parent Members Engagement:

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

Parent members participated in the VI-ICC meetings where there were discussions about setting new targets. The suggestion to keep the targets the same as in previous years was agreed upon by the parent members. The VI-ITP Service Coordinators constantly ask Providers for suggestions of additional parent members to assist.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Coping with the impact of Covid-19 has been challenging. When in-person learning was not feasible providers pivoted to check-in telephone calls as well as emailing parents additional learning materials for them to work on with their children.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Public input was not solicited at this time.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

At this time there has not been any availability to the public.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

The APRs are currently posted on the DOH website and in each district in the administrative offices of the ITP. The report will also be issued to the SSIP stakeholders, early intervention providers, and parents of children in the program. All stakeholders are asked for input on the enhancement of the State Performance Plan and any improvement activities. The website for the SPP/APR is https://doh.vi.gov

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

VIDH has not publicly reported on the FFY 2018 (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019) performance of each EIS program or provider located in the VIDH on the targets in the VIDH's performance plan as required by sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 642 of IDEA. With its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, VIDH must provide a Web link demonstrating that VIDH reported to the public on the performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the VIDH on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2018, FFY 2017 and FFY 2016. In addition, VIDH must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, how and where VIDH reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

The VIDH's IDEA Part C determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the VIDH's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised VIDH of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required VIDH to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed VIDH to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. VIDH must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which VIDH received assistance; and (2) the actions the VIDH took as a result of that technical assistance.

VIDH must provide the FFY 2020 required data for Indicator 11, including the VIDH's progress in implementing the State Systemic Improvement Plan, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The VI-ITP will change the formatting of the SPP/APRs that are currently posted on the VIDH website. The program has requested assistance from the DaSy Center TA providers and the ECTA. There have been several meetings held to provide assistance with the APR and reformatting the local report for posting to the DOH website.

Intro - OSEP Response

Virgin Island's (VI) State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. § 303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support VI lead agency's submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with VI's SPP/APR documents.

VI's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 22, 2021 determination letter informed VI that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which VI received assistance; and (2) the actions VI took as a result of that technical assistance. VI provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

Virgin Island Department of Health's (VIDH) IDEA Part C FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 grants were subject to both OSEP Specific Conditions as well as Department-wide Specific Conditions.

VI has not publicly reported on the FFY 2019 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020), FFY 2018 (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019), FFY 2017 (July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018), and FFY 2016 (July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017) performance of each EIS program or provider located in the VI on the targets in VI's performance

plan as required by sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 642 of IDEA. With its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, VI must provide a Web link demonstrating that VI reported to the public on the performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the VI on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2019, FFY 2018, FFY 2017 and FFY 2016. In addition, VI must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, how and where VI reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the VI on the targets in the SPP/APR.

VI's IDEA Part C determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In VI's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised VI of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required VI to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed VI to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

VI must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which VI received assistance; and (2) the actions VI took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.80%	96.60%	98.70%	99.55%	95.13%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
196	219	95.13%	100%	99.09%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

21

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Children traveled to other jurisdictions for additional medical opinions or medical care. Parents preferred to delay start times due to concerns of contracting COVID-19.

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Timely services are defined as the time period from parents' consent on the IFSP and when the early intervention was started, which is 30 days.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The data was collected for the period of July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

This data accurately reflect all children for whom and IFSP was developed from July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021. The Service Coordinator in each district receives the information/reports from the Providers and enters the information in the database. The database has formulas in place to indicate the upcoming due dates.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

There were 2 findings of noncompliance for FFY 2020. The Providers assigned to these cases were concerned about Covid 19, therefore the cases had to be reassigned. The files were reviewed and an alternative plan was developed between the newly assigned Provider and the families. The children affected received services despite being late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	0	5	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The findings of noncompliance for 2019 were reviewed and corrected. The ITP Acting Director reviewed the monthly reports for three consecutive months, trying to maintain compliance. Covid 19 impacted this process.

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

The Virgin Islands went into "Lock down" several times beginning March 2020 due to Covid 19. Each individual child's record was reviewed, reassigning the cases as quickly as possible where the initial Service Coordinator was ill or very concerned about their own well being. There have not been any children that have not received services despite being late.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	1	1	0

FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As a result of the non-compliance findings, the Coordinator's Monthly Reports were reviewed. There have not been any children that have not received services despite being late.

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

Within the first month of services provided to the individual child, the coordinator and provider discussed the actual start of services noting it in the child's records. All children have received services despite being late.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because VIDH reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, VIDH must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, VIDH must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, VIDH must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and the EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018: (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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, VIDH must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If VIDH did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why VIDH did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

There was not an identification of a finding of noncompliance in FFY 2019. Once it was noted that the service was late, there was a discussion with the Interim Service Coordinators and it was determined that the child received services despite being late.

1 - OSEP Response

VI did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, VI did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018: (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 EIS program or provider.

1 - Required Actions

Because VI reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, VI must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, VI must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, VI must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If VI did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why VI did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

VI must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining findings identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, VI must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019: (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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, VI must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Reporting on the third party fiduciary payments to ensure timely service provision is part of the VIDH’s FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 IDEA Part C grant award specific conditions. The VIDH timely submitted its February 1, 2022, progress report and its May 1, 2022, progress report under its FFY 2021 IDEA Part C Specific Conditions. OSEP will respond to the VIDH's IDEA Part C Specific Conditions February 1, and May 1, 2022 progress reports in its FFY 2022 IDEA Part C grant award letter.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	96.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target>=	94.00%	95.00%	96.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Data	98.35%	100.00%	93.18%	96.08%	95.19%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

Due to the uncertainty of the COVID - 19 virus and the possibilities of ongoing spikes in cases, the ICC members advised that targets should remain the same as previous years.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	97
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	105

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
97	105	95.19%	97.00%	92.38%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

The Virgin Islands have been in a constant state of recovery since the devastating storms of 2017. As circumstances were beginning to improve, we were set back by COVID - 19 in March 2020. We continue to experience vast fluctuations in COVID positivity rates, some being as high as 24%. Parents have opted not to have services provided in their homes; some parents preferred having services conducted in the clinics. At the clinic sites, temperatures were checked upon arrival and hand sanitizer was available. Alternative methods have been virtual; however, not all parents have access to reliable technology which impacts virtual learning. Some daycare centers/preschools restricted outside persons access to their facilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling of **infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target>=	86.00%	86.50%	86.50%	87.00%	87.00%
A1	84.20%	Data	80.00%	91.30%	87.93%	86.90%	84.91%
A2	2008	Target>=	53.50%	54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.00%
A2	52.40%	Data	62.22%	52.17%	49.18%	62.92%	50.46%
B1	2008	Target>=	86.00%	86.50%	86.50%	87.00%	87.00%
B1	84.20%	Data	74.36%	91.30%	91.67%	92.05%	92.59%
B2	2008	Target>=	42.00%	42.50%	43.00%	43.50%	43.50%
B2	40.50%	Data	56.52%	41.30%	40.98%	51.69%	52.29%
C1	2008	Target>=	86.00%	86.50%	86.50%	87.00%	87.00%
C1	83.80%	Data	77.50%	89.13%	85.00%	85.88%	85.19%
C2	2008	Target>=	69.50%	69.50%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%
C2	69.00%	Data	55.56%	36.96%	47.54%	58.43%	46.36%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1>=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target A2>=	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%
Target B1>=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B2>=	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%
Target C1>=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target C2>=	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

51

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	8	15.69%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	27	52.94%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	16	31.37%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	43	51	84.91%	87.00%	84.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	16	51	50.46%	55.00%	31.37%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

March 2020 the Virgin Islands experienced a territory-wide shut down due to Covid 19. The ITP was unable to schedule in person meeting times with families. The solution for not having in-person meetings was to offer virtual meetings. However, several parents continually postponed virtual meetings due to overwhelming circumstances. Because schools were closed, those parents with older siblings were overwhelmed with working with those older children with virtual education. There were some children who providers were able to work with virtually who showed some improvement despite having existing medical conditions. Other children were entering the program less than 6 months before turning 3 years, not allowing time to see much developmental growth.

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6	11.76%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	28	54.90%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	17	33.33%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	45	51	92.59%	87.00%	88.24%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	17	51	52.29%	43.50%	33.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

March 2020 the Virgin Islands experienced a territory-wide shut down due to Covid 19. The ITP was unable to schedule in person meeting times with families. The solution for not having in-person meetings was to offer virtual meetings. However, several parents continually postponed virtual meetings due to overwhelming circumstances. Because schools were closed, those parents with older siblings were overwhelmed with working with those older children with virtual education. There were some children who providers were able to work with virtually who showed some improvement despite having

existing medical conditions. Other children were entering the program less than 6 months before turning 3 years, not allowing time to see much developmental growth.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	10	19.61%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	24	47.06%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	17	33.33%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	0	0.00%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	41	51	85.19%	87.00%	80.39%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	17	51	46.36%	70.00%	33.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

March 2020 the Virgin Islands experienced a territory-wide shut down due to Covid 19. The ITP was unable to schedule in person meeting times with families. The solution for not having in-person meetings was to offer virtual meetings. However, several parents continually postponed virtual meetings due to overwhelming circumstances. Because schools were closed, those parents with older siblings were overwhelmed with working with those older children with virtual education. There were some children who providers were able to work with virtually who showed some improvement despite having existing medical conditions. Other children were entering the program less than 6 months before turning 3 years, not allowing time to see much developmental growth.

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

March 2020 the Virgin Islands experienced a territory-wide shut down due to Covid 19. The ITP was unable to schedule in person meeting times with families. The solution for not having in-person meetings was to offer virtual meetings. However, several parents continually postponed virtual meetings due to overwhelming circumstances. Because schools were closed, those parents with older siblings were overwhelmed with working with those older children with virtual education. There were some children who providers were able to work with virtually who showed some improvement despite having existing medical conditions. Other children were entering the program less than 6 months before turning 3 years, not allowing time to see much developmental growth.

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting 618 data	114
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	41

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

There is a collaboration between the parent, provider, and coordinator to discuss the ELAP assessment tool's results. The ITP is using the ECO COS form upon entry to the program and at exit. Parent input is encouraged and considered during the meetings as well as assessments made by the Providers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

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

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

*Sampling of **families participating in Part C** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year's response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2024, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, States must include race and ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2006	Target>=	93.00%	94.00%	94.00%	98.00%	98.00%
A	86.00%	Data	95.45%	100.00%	94.37%	98.28%	100.00%
B	2006	Target>=	87.00%	88.00%	88.00%	98.00%	98.00%
B	86.00%	Data	98.86%	97.67%	94.37%	98.28%	100.00%
C	2006	Target>=	93.00%	94.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%

C	86.00 %	Data	97.73%	100.00%	94.37%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A>=	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Target B>=	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Target C>=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	60
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	59
Survey Response Rate	98.33%
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	58
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	59
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	59
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	59
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	59
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	59

Measure	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	100.00%	98.00%	98.31%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	100.00%	98.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Question	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES

Question	Yes / No
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

Survey Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Survey Response Rate	100.00%	98.33%

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

As a result of the pandemic, surveys were sent to families via email. Once the pandemic is no longer a major threat, transition meetings will occur in person which will minimize the likelihood of surveys not being returned to the ITP. If we continue in the current pandemic state there will have to be an increased effort to contact and retrieve the surveys.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

Demographically the families are represented as the Virgin Islands is a predominantly "African American" population. The surveys returned were broken down as follows: Black 42 Hispanic 7 White 3 Two or more races 7 There was one survey returned that was not completed but indicates the child's information.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4 - OSEP Response

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

OSEP cannot determine whether VI analyzed the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, including steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents with disabilities, as required by the Measurement Table.

VI did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

4 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, VI must analyze the response rate to identify potential non-response bias and identify steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. VI must also describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the E*DFacts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations.The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.38%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	1.42%	1.44%	1.48%	1.48%	1.48%
Data	0.96%	1.02%	0.42%	0.96%	1.38%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	1.48%	1.48%	1.48%	1.48%	1.48%	1.48%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	18
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020	07/08/2021	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	1,672

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
18	1,672	1.38%	1.48%	1.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

As a result of the pandemic, the referral sources curtailed their services to reduce the spread of the COVID-19. There have been numerous occasions where the Governor required non essential persons to "stay at home" this prevented parents from keeping well child visits which in turn may have generated referrals. Referral sources are MCH clinic, daycare centers, and pediatricians.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations . The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	2.58%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	2.62%	2.65%	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%
Data	2.08%	1.84%	1.52%	1.76%	1.79%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	105
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020	07/08/2021	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	5,807

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
105	5,807	1.79%	2.70%	1.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The information used in this Indicator was from the 2010 Census. The 2020 Census has shown that the Virgin Islands population has decreased, as a result there may be a need to review the current targets and determine whether or not they should be changed. This review will be conducted with the VI-ICC as well as the ITP Service Coordinators.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

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

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	97.79%	100.00%	99.10%	99.59%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
193	216	99.59%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

23

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Due to several mandatory "stay at home" orders, there have been challenges with scheduling of appointments for evaluations, this then changes the time allotted to then schedule subsequent meetings. Providers had difficulty contacting parents or had to constantly reschedule appointments at the request of the families. Some families with infants chose not to leave their homes or introduce anyone outside their "bubble" of close relatives into their homes.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The VI Infants and Toddlers Program reviewed all children with IFSPs during the period July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As a result of the non-compliance findings, the monthly reports were reviewed for a period of 2 months and maintained 100% compliance.

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

The Service Coordinator and the assigned Provider discussed the actual start of services noting the date in the child's record.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

VIDH did not provide the reasons for delay as required by the Measurement Table. VIDH must report reasons for delay for FFY 2020 in its FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Because VIDH reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, VIDH must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, VIDH must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, VIDH must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If VIDH did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why VIDH did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

VIDH did not report that it identified any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, VIDH must provide an explanation of why it did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

FFY 2018

There were 2 findings of non-compliance. As a result the monthly reports were reviewed for a period of two months and maintained 100% compliance. Each child's record was reviewed with the Interim Coordinator and the assigned Provider noting the actual start of service in the child

7 - OSEP Response

VI did not demonstrate that the EIS program or provider corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, VI did not report that that it verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider.

7 - Required Actions

VI must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining findings identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, VI must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, VI must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
86	86	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances
This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data was collected for the time period July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The Infants and Toddlers Program reviewed children with IFSPs from July 1, 2019, to June 30, 2020.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
59	59	100.00%	100%	NVR	Met target	No Slippage

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Describe the method used to collect these data.

The Infants & Toddlers Program utilized the recently upgraded Excel database to review the children with IFSPs from July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)

NO

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	94.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	88.64%	76.06%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. (yes/no)

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
71	76	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

5

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

COVID-19 has been proven to be stressful for the families the VI-ITP serves. One family agreed to meet with Part B but did not appear for the virtual meeting at the scheduled time. One family was out of the territory and unable to return due to COVID restrictions. Two children entered the program with a short amount of time to be serviced and transition at the scheduled time. One family decided not to meet for the transition meeting due to Covid 19 concerns.

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

State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

This data accurately reflect all children for whom and IFSP was developed or has in effect from July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021. The Service Coordinator in each district regularly receives the information/reports from the Providers and enters the information in the database. The database has formulas in place to indicate the upcoming due dates.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025

Target>=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

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

11 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

The percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who were functioning within age expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://doh.vi.gov

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2008	40.50%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%	43.50%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	Total number of infants and toddlers exiting who had been receiving services for at least 6 months	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
17	51	52.29%	43.50%	33.33%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

March 2020 the Virgin Islands experienced a territory-wide shut down due to Covid 19. The ITP was unable to schedule in person meeting times with families. The solution for not having in-person meetings was to offer virtual meetings. However, several parents continually postponed virtual meetings due to overwhelming circumstances. Because schools were closed, those parents with older siblings were overwhelmed with working with those older children with virtual education. There were some children who providers were able to work with virtually who showed some improvement despite having existing medical conditions. Other children were entering the program less than 6 months before turning 3 years, not allowing time to see much developmental growth.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

The data is from Indicator C3, Summary statement B2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program. The information is received from the EI service providers when they conduct the entry and exit COS reports. The information is entered into the VI-ITP Excel database which calculates the data. The numerator is the number of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. The denominator is the total number of infants and toddlers exiting who had been receiving services for at least 6 months

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

The information is received from the EI service providers when they conduct the entry and exit COS reports. The information is entered into the VI-ITP Excel database which calculates the data.

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

NO

Describe how the data support the decision not to make revisions to the evaluation plan. Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

The VI-ITP has not had a Program Director in place since May 2019, as a result, several items on the evaluation plan have been placed on hold. The Program Director position has now been filled since December 2021. There will be a thorough review of the plan and discussions will be had with the VI-ICC and Service Coordinators to determine the best way to proceed. In addition, there have been a few "stay at home" orders due to Covid-19 which has impacted the implementation of some areas in the plan. The current evaluation plan will be posted to the DOH website.

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

The VI-ICC has been able to meet virtually in February 2021, May 2021 and December 2021. The council consists of 21 persons including 4 parents. The Third Party Fiduciary Contract is in place until November 2023. The Case Manager job description has been updated and revised with the new title of Service Coordinator. The previous job description was shared with the VI-ICC and the members were in agreement that the change was necessary. The change was completed and approved by the Government's Personnel Department in July 2021. The ITP Database (Excel Spreadsheet) was updated with additional formulas to better report more accurate data.

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

The VI-ICC provided feedback concerning the job description. The change in the JD resulted in more candidates who were interested in working with the program. Therefore more candidates have been identified as qualifying for interviewing for the two vacant positions. The Program Administrator position will be filled before the end of 2022. The person will be responsible for coordinating between the Service Coordinators and the Director to make sure that the OSEP mandates are being met. Providers were able to attend online webinars to improve their skills in evidence-based practices. The Military Family Learning Network was one such organization providing free webinars with the opportunity to receive continuing education credits.

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

NO

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

There will be a thorough review of the plan and discussions will be had with the VI-ICC and Service Coordinators to determine the best way to proceed. The Data System is working well and is enabling the program to provide more accurate data. As additional information is needed there is the opportunity to upgrade with the assistance of the DaSy and ECTA our TA organizations. The ITP has begun to reach out to community organizations to raise awareness about the program and the need to identify children with special needs sooner in order to get them to perform at the same level as their peers by the time they reach 3 years old. Professional development is ongoing. Providers participated in The Play Project in April 2022. The ITP will partner with VI Family Partnership to address the needs of the families by helping them with assistance from the various government programs.

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

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

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

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

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

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

There will be a thorough review of the plan and discussions will be had with the VI-ICC and Service Coordinators to determine the best way to proceed. There will be a meeting with DaSy and ECTA to review and update the SSIP in May 2022.

Describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The activities, strategies or timelines described in previous submissions have not been changed. There has been a delay for several reasons. The Program Director position has been vacant since May 2019 when the then Director went on medical leave and subsequently retired in August 2019. This void was left to the then Program Administrator who was in the Acting Director position until December 2021.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Virgin Islands Infants and Toddlers stakeholders consist of members of the VI Interagency Coordinating Council (VI-ICC), who advises and assist the ITP regarding the provision of early intervention services for children with disabilities from birth to three and other child development agencies. There were three meetings held in February 2021, May 2021 and November 2021. The council has a diverse membership, including parents of children with a disability and state agencies involved in the provision of early intervention services, a member responsible for the State Medicare program, the SEA responsible for child care, and other entities who give the ITP advice in all areas of child development. Conference calls were held with available stakeholders to discuss the targets and how they will be reached during this pandemic. Based on the review of the 2019 APR targets, the VI-ICC members suggested that the targets remain constant due to the uncertainty of the impact of Covid-19 moving forward.

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

Several VI-ICC meetings were held since members were appointed in 2020 by the newly elected Governor. Meetings were also held in February 2021, May 2021, and November 2021. During the February 2021 meeting, the federal reports were outlined and described to members in attendance. In subsequent meetings, the setting of targets was discussed.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The VI-ICC was concerned that the Service Coordinator positions on St. Croix were still vacant. There was also concern that the job description was not suited for the Infants and Toddlers Program. The job description was in the process of being updated since 2019 and was finally approved in July 2021. The program is still trying to fill the positions. Several meetings have been had with the VIDH HR department.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

The ITP has begun meeting with independent groups that could be possible avenues for child find. One such meeting was held in April 2022 with the State Family Program and Family Assistance Center for the Virgin Islands National Guard. The center visited the VI-ICC Facebook page. They also will include an "Infants and Toddlers" Corner in their monthly newsletter/bulletin. When improvements with the pandemic remain level, they plan to schedule a training with the Zero to Three Organization that have a wealth of resources and services to offer for our demographic.

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

The ITP will have in place the Service Coordinators on St. Croix by June 2022. Interviews are currently being scheduled, this will be done with one of the Interim Service Coordinators present.

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

The Infant & Toddlers Program struggles to have enough EI providers. During monthly Provider meetings, the Service Coordinator reminds the staff of the need for additional Providers. Covid 19 continues to impact the families, Providers, and the Program. Parents and providers continue to be wary of the possibility of contracting the Covid 19 so there is a delicate balance between in-person learning and virtual. On April 24, 2022, the VI active Covid cases increased again to 248 persons (140 STX 107 STT) bringing the 7-day positivity rate to 6%.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

The VI provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The VI did not provide a Theory of Action or Evaluation Plan, as required by the Measurement Table. Further, the VI did not: 1) summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity; 2) describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing programs, policies and/or practices; 3) summarize the strategies or activities that ensured the used of evidence-based practices with fidelity; or 4) describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts, as required by the Measurement Table.

11 - Required Actions

The VI did not report on all of the required components of this indicator. In the FFY 2021, SPP/APR, the VI must report on all required components of this indicator, consistent with the Measurement Table.

OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 11 attachment(s) included in the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.