



ENCLOSURE 2

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2011 IDEA PART B LEA PERFORMANCE DETERMINATIONS

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| LEA: | Cedar Tree PCS (Formerly Howard Road Academy PCS) |
| Final Percentage Rating: | 64% |
| Determination Level: | Needs Assistance |

SUMMARY OF EACH REQUIRED ELEMENT AND RATING ASSIGNED

| Element | Element Description | Determination | Number of Points Achieved | Number of Points Possible |
|----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | History, nature and length of time of any reported noncompliance (APR Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 4b – not in compliance • Indicator 9 – in compliance • Indicator 10 – in compliance • Indicator 11 – not in compliance • Indicator 12 – N/A • Indicator 13 – N/A | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | Information regarding timely, valid and reliable data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all data are submitted timely | 0 | 4 |
| 3a | Identified noncompliance from on-site compliance monitoring and/or focused monitoring | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA did not receive a report in FFY 2011 as the result of an on-site monitoring visit | N/A | N/A |
| 3b | Dispute resolution findings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dispute resolution complaints were filed against the LEA | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| 4 | Outcomes of sub-recipient audit reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely submission of A-133 Report (if applicable) – 4 points • Type of Auditor’s A-133 Report Issued on Compliance (if applicable) – 4 points • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – 4 points • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – 4 points • Auditor’s designation as low-risk sub-recipient in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – 4 points • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the annual independent audit – 4 points • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the annual independent audit – 4 points • Noncompliance or other matters identified by the Auditor that is required to be reported under Government Auditing Standard – 4 points | 4 (average points) | 4 (average points) |
| 5 | Other data available to OSSE regarding the LEA’s compliance with the IDEA, including, but not limited to, relevant financial data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely LEA submission of Phase I and Phase II applications and reimbursement for a minimum of 45% of its IDEA, Section 611 funds within the first 15 months of the FFY 2011 grants cycle | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | Compliance with the IDEA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA in compliance with the IDEA MOE requirement and LEA reported on MOE to OSSE timely | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | Performance on selected District of Columbia State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA did not meet District of Columbia FFY 2011 AYP targets for the disability subgroup | 0 | 2 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|---|
| 8 | Evidence of correction of findings of noncompliance, including progress toward full compliance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of noncompliance corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year after the identification of the noncompliance | 2 | 2 |
| Total Number of Points Achieved | | | 14 | |
| Total Possible Points from Applicable Elements | | | 22 | |
| Percentage of Points Achieved from Applicable Elements | | | 64% | |