



ENCLOSURE 2

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2012 IDEA PART B LEA PERFORMANCE DETERMINATIONS

LEA:	Options Public Charter School
Final Percentage Rating:	63%
Determination Level:	Needs Assistance

SUMMARY OF EACH REQUIRED ELEMENT AND RATING ASSIGNED

Element	Element Description	Determination Criteria	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 –compliant • Indicator 9 – compliant • Indicator 10 – compliant • Indicator 11 – noncompliant • Indicator 12 – N/A • Indicator 13 – noncompliant 	3	5
2	Information regarding timely, valid and reliable data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All data are submitted timely 	4	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 2012 as the result of an on-site monitoring visit 	N/A	N/A
3b	Dispute resolution findings	LEA has more than 100 students with IEPs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dispute resolution complaints were filed against the LEA or 0-16 findings of noncompliance 	2	2

4	Outcomes of sub-recipient audit reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely submission of A-133 Report (if applicable) – 4 • Type of Auditor’s A-133 Report Issued on Compliance (if applicable) – 0 • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – 2 • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – 0 • Auditor’s designation as low-risk sub-recipient in the A-133 Report (if applicable) – 0 • Significant deficiencies identified by the Auditor that are not a material weakness in the annual independent audit – 4 • Material weaknesses identified by the Auditor in the annual independent audit – 0 • Noncompliance or other matters identified by the Auditor that is required to be reported under Government Auditing Standard – 4 	1.75	4
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 2012 grants cycle 	4	4
6	Compliance with the IDEA Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA did not report on MOE timely to OSSE 	0	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 2012 AMO math targets for the disability subgroup –0 • LEA did not meet District of Columbia FFY 2012 AMO reading targets for the disability subgroup – 0 	0	2

8	Evidence of correction of findings of noncompliance, including progress toward full compliance (points added to total score)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less than 90% of noncompliance corrected within one year after the identification of the noncompliance 	0	2
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BONUS: LEA has no longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2011, 2010 and 2009 	1	
Total Number of Points Achieved				15.75
Total Possible Points from Applicable Elements				25
Percentage of Points Achieved from Applicable Elements				63%