

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

for

STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS

under the

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

As amended by the

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on

School Year 2007-08

WEST VIRGINIA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008

PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

West Virginia

Address:

1900 Kanawha Blvd
Charleston, WV 25305

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Nancy Walker

Telephone: 304-558-8869

Fax: 304-558-3584

e-mail: nwalker@access.k12.wv.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Steve Paine

Wednesday, March 11, 2009, 12:19:41 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) has revised the reading/language arts, mathematics, science, social studies content standards and objectives (CSOs) (effective July 1, 2008). The State Board approved 21st century content standards may be found on the WVDE website: <http://wvde.state.wv.us/>; specifically, Policy 2520.1 (reading/language arts), Policy 2520.2 (mathematics), Policy 2520.3 (science), and Policy 2520.4 (social studies): <http://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/>.

These CSOs are aligned to 21st century skills, ACT standards, NAEP standards and TIMSS standards. The 21st century CSOs were reviewed by Dr. Norman Webb, University of Wisconsin; Dr. William Schmidt, Michigan State University; and the 21st Century Partnership.

The Alternate Academic Achievement Standards for West Virginia Schools (Policy 2520.16) were reviewed and found to be in alignment with the 21st century CSOs. The Policy was effective as of August 2008.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state accountability assessments for mathematics and reading/language arts have been revised to align to the revised content standards and objectives (CSOs). The West Virginia Educational Standards Test (WESTEST) 2 for grades 3-11 was developed to align to the revised CSOs and will be operational in May 2009. The WESTEST 2 Online Writing for grades 3-11 will be operation Spring 2009. The WESTEST 2 Online Writing scores will be aggregated with the WESTEST 2 reading/language arts for a combine reading/language arts score. WESTEST 2 results for mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3-8 and 11 will be used for AYP calculations.

Standard setting for WESTEST 2 will be conducted in 2009 and the cut scores will be presented to the State Board for approval. West Virginia is following the assessment development requirements listed in the Federal Peer Review document.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state accountability assessments for science have been revised to align to the revised content standards and objectives (CSOs). The West Virginia Educational Standards Test (WESTEST) 2 for grades 3-11 was developed to align to the revised CSOs and will be operational in May 2009.

Standard setting for WESTEST 2 science will be conducted in 2009 and the cut scores will be presented to the State Board for approval. West Virginia is following the assessment development requirements listed in the Federal Peer Review document.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State NCLB assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	142,932	141,480	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	153	146	95.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,006	996	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	7,737	7,622	98.5
Hispanic	1,270	1,254	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	132,766	131,462	99.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,395	21,848	97.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	758	746	98.4
Economically disadvantaged students	74,259	73,304	98.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	88.9
Male	73,397	72,550	98.8
Female	69,535	68,930	99.1
Comments: Correct as reported -very small number			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,183	32.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,866	58.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,799	8.2
Total	21,848	

Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	142,933	141,449	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	153	146	95.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,006	996	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	7,737	7,610	98.4
Hispanic	1,270	1,255	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	132,767	131,442	99.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,397	21,829	97.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	758	747	98.6
Economically disadvantaged students	74,261	73,287	98.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	88.9
Male	73,398	72,519	98.8
Female	69,535	68,930	99.1
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,946	50.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,084	41.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,799	8.2
Total	21,829	
Comments:		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	142,934	138,795	97.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	153	145	94.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,006	983	97.7
Black, non-Hispanic	7,737	7,404	95.7
Hispanic	1,270	1,234	97.2
White, non-Hispanic	132,768	129,029	97.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,397	19,768	88.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	758	735	97.0
Economically disadvantaged students	74,261	71,445	96.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	88.9
Male	73,398	70,871	96.6
Female	69,536	67,924	97.7
Comments: Information correct as reported.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,754	32.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,014	63.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	786	3.8
Total	20,554	
Comments: Only grade levels 4, 8 and 11 were tested using the APTA Science test; hence, the smaller number of tested students in science. Additionally, for APTA reading/LA and Math, tested grades were 3 through 8 and 10. For science APTA, grades 2, 8, and 11 only were tested.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State NCLB assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	19,997	15,071	75.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	10	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	152	131	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,145	748	65.3
Hispanic	191	134	70.2
White, non-Hispanic	18,494	14,048	76.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,619	2,020	55.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	126	83	65.9
Economically disadvantaged students	11,197	7,646	68.3
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,154	7,573	74.6
Female	9,843	7,498	76.2
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	20,001	15,818	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	10	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	152	140	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,146	835	72.9
Hispanic	191	141	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	18,497	14,692	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,619	1,860	51.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	126	90	71.4
Economically disadvantaged students	11,198	8,082	72.2
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,155	7,580	74.6
Female	9,846	8,238	83.7
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	19,695	17,106	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	10	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	151	140	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,125	878	78.0
Hispanic	190	162	85.3
White, non-Hispanic	18,214	15,916	87.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,350	2,551	76.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	125	99	79.2
Economically disadvantaged students	10,969	9,032	82.3
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	9,951	8,538	85.8
Female	9,744	8,568	87.9
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,121	15,331	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	24	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	153	137	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,117	752	67.3
Hispanic	187	132	70.6
White, non-Hispanic	18,632	14,286	76.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,392	1,706	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	116	88	75.9
Economically disadvantaged students	11,116	7,624	68.6
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,271	7,804	76.0
Female	9,850	7,527	76.4
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,115	16,543	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	27	84.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	153	143	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,117	853	76.4
Hispanic	187	154	82.4
White, non-Hispanic	18,626	15,366	82.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,393	1,653	48.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	116	91	78.5
Economically disadvantaged students	11,114	8,437	75.9
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,269	8,075	78.6
Female	9,846	8,468	86.0
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	19,799	17,009	85.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	32	29	90.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	149	144	96.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,092	821	75.2
Hispanic	183	150	82.0
White, non-Hispanic	18,343	15,865	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,110	2,212	71.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	115	90	78.3
Economically disadvantaged students	10,878	8,741	80.4
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,076	8,658	85.9
Female	9,723	8,351	85.9
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	19,915	16,089	80.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	13	81.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	135	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,084	804	74.2
Hispanic	189	150	79.4
White, non-Hispanic	18,480	14,987	81.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,969	1,518	51.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	126	94	74.6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,752	8,020	74.6
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,230	8,197	80.1
Female	9,685	7,892	81.5
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	19,912	15,843	79.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	13	81.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	133	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,084	821	75.7
Hispanic	190	138	72.6
White, non-Hispanic	18,476	14,738	79.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,964	1,232	41.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	127	83	65.4
Economically disadvantaged students	10,751	7,795	72.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,227	7,663	74.9
Female	9,685	8,180	84.5
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	19,618	16,775	85.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	13	81.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	135	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,064	814	76.5
Hispanic	186	148	79.6
White, non-Hispanic	18,206	15,665	86.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,700	1,820	67.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	125	93	74.4
Economically disadvantaged students	10,535	8,423	80.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,042	8,695	86.6
Female	9,576	8,080	84.4
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,110	15,500	77.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	14	70.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	133	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,061	698	65.8
Hispanic	162	114	70.4
White, non-Hispanic	18,721	14,541	77.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,967	1,192	40.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	110	74	67.3
Economically disadvantaged students	10,714	7,456	69.6
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	10,336	7,885	76.3
Female	9,774	7,615	77.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,116	16,513	82.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	15	75.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	146	137	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,060	808	76.2
Hispanic	162	122	75.3
White, non-Hispanic	18,728	15,431	82.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,963	1,214	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	110	80	72.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,718	8,059	75.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	10,339	7,972	77.1
Female	9,777	8,541	87.4
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	19,751	17,190	87.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	18	90.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	143	133	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,031	807	78.3
Hispanic	159	129	81.1
White, non-Hispanic	18,398	16,103	87.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,671	1,659	62.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	107	81	75.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,453	8,561	81.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	10,115	8,730	86.3
Female	9,636	8,460	87.8
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	20,885	16,119	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	21	91.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	137	119	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,161	785	67.6
Hispanic	177	128	72.3
White, non-Hispanic	19,387	15,066	77.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,035	1,121	36.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102	59	57.8
Economically disadvantaged students	10,741	7,415	69.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,745	8,181	76.1
Female	10,140	7,938	78.3
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	20,881	17,173	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	20	87.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	137	123	89.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,160	879	75.8
Hispanic	178	143	80.3
White, non-Hispanic	19,383	16,008	82.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,030	1,266	41.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102	72	70.6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,739	8,052	75.0
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,739	8,273	77.0
Female	10,142	8,900	87.8
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	20,480	17,127	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	22	95.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	136	122	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,125	827	73.5
Hispanic	176	146	83.0
White, non-Hispanic	19,020	16,010	84.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,734	1,392	50.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	101	72	71.3
Economically disadvantaged students	10,463	8,000	76.5
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	10,489	8,688	82.8
Female	9,991	8,439	84.5
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	20,935	15,206	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	12	80.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	126	114	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,093	648	59.3
Hispanic	185	130	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	19,516	14,302	73.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,112	976	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	99	63	63.6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,462	6,599	63.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,900	7,994	73.3
Female	10,035	7,212	71.9
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	20,935	16,861	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	11	73.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	126	116	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,092	794	72.7
Hispanic	184	155	84.2
White, non-Hispanic	19,518	15,785	80.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,108	1,171	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	99	71	71.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,469	7,646	73.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,894	8,121	74.5
Female	10,041	8,740	87.0
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	20,449	17,407	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	13	92.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	125	119	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,051	772	73.5
Hispanic	183	152	83.1
White, non-Hispanic	19,076	16,351	85.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,753	1,504	54.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	99	73	73.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,133	7,967	78.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,583	8,925	84.3
Female	9,866	8,482	86.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
High School			
All students	19,517	13,268	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	14	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	136	114	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	961	478	49.7
Hispanic	163	85	52.1
White, non-Hispanic	18,232	12,577	69.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,754	614	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	67	32	47.8
Economically disadvantaged students	8,322	4,745	57.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	9,914	6,518	65.7
Female	9,603	6,750	70.3
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
High School			
All students	19,489	14,399	73.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	13	52.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	136	114	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	951	600	63.1
Hispanic	163	102	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	18,214	13,570	74.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,752	727	26.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	67	35	52.2
Economically disadvantaged students	8,298	5,270	63.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	9,896	6,614	66.8
Female	9,593	7,785	81.2
Comments: Correct as reported			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
High School			
All students	19,003	16,226	85.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	19	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	133	120	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	916	650	71.0
Hispanic	157	118	75.2
White, non-Hispanic	17,772	15,319	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,450	1,233	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	64	43	67.2
Economically disadvantaged students	8,014	6,245	77.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	9,615	8,050	83.7
Female	9,388	8,176	87.1
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	693	559	80.7
Districts	57	6	10.5
Comments: 2 of the 57 districts are considered districts for internal purposes only and do not receive an AYP status(Institutional Programs and the School for the Deaf and Blind) 2 of the 6 are considered districts for internal purposes only and do not receive an AYP status(Institutional Programs and the School for the Deaf and Blind) Therefore, there should be a total of 55 districts and a total of 4 districts which met AYP in SY 07-08.			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	356	324	91.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	339	307	90.6
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	17	17	100.0
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
55	4	7.3
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments: correct as reported	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
Comments: WV had only one school in restructuring 2 for the 07-08 school year.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Staff was organized into grade level professional learning communities which meet daily. An additional administrator was hired to focus solely on curriculum and instruction.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.**)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

² The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Statewide System of Support for district improvement is addressed at three levels.

The first level is capacity building for all 55 school districts in the state. This takes place within a framework described in a visionary document The Frameworks for High Performing 21st Century School Systems. This document describes in six Goals the vision that the West Virginia Department of Education and its Board has for school systems in West Virginia. This document describes the culture, instructional practices, curriculum, leadership for effective schools, student and parent support and continuous school improvement research based practices that a district should have in order to prepare graduates for the 21st century.

The capacity for implementing this vision for districts is built through a state level professional development program which has several parts. The School System Leadership Team Conference series is a semiannual conference in which a school system leadership team is provided with research and best practice in a central setting through national leaders in educational research and practice and clinics from school districts that are using the research based practices effectively. All levels of the school system are provided with additional state level professional development.

School leadership capacity building takes place through the Leadership Institute for the 21st Century. This institute provides a 6 day summer institute a four day follow up session in both the fall and spring all connected by on-line discussion forum. The Institute is in its third year and will include all West Virginia principals by the end of five years. The state also provides a teacher leadership week long summer institute with on-line follow up throughout the year. This team of teachers from each district involves school and district leadership in discussion about required professional development plans for developing teachers capable of growing students capable of becoming 21st century graduates. All of this state level professional development is guided by the Frameworks document.

The second level of capacity building for the districts is helping districts effectively plan improvement efforts through an on-line 5 year strategic planning tool. This tool helps guide districts and schools through a plan do study act cycle of quality improvement. This online tool also is the place where school districts that are identified for improvement or corrective action access additional targeted technical assistance. As the districts rewrite their plan after identification they have the opportunity to request technical assistance if they are identified for improvement and must request technical assistance if they are identified for corrective action.

The third level of capacity building for districts is after they have been identified for improvement or corrective action and have requested technical assistance. The requests for technical assistance are assigned to West Virginia Department of Education staff Regional Educational Service Agency staff other agencies such as institutions of higher education and USDE comprehensive centers or consultants to provide the technical assistance. The districts have subsequent years NCLB funding deferred until plans are rewritten to implement the requested technical assistance provided.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	21
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	21
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	1
Schools	4	2
Comments: Information determined and reported from the WVDE Office of Education Performance Audits (OEPA)		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	
---	--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
- Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
- Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
- Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	0	0
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	0	0
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	0.0	0.0
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	0	0
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	0.0	0.0
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	0	
Comments: WV was unable to retain a 4% setaside for school improvement last year (SY 2007-2008)resulting in no funding to support 1003 (a). This was due to a large reduction in the state's Title I allocation as well as the hold harmless provision. LEA 1003(g) sub-grants were issued in the summer of 2008 and did not affect proficiency on the state standardized test. Therefore, zero was entered in both columns.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	0
Comments: WV was unable to retain a 4% setaside for school improvment last year (SY 2007-2008)resulting in no funding to support 1003 (a). This was due to a large reduction in the state's Title I allocation as well as the hold harmless provision. LEA 1003(g) sub-grants were issued in the summer of 2008 and did not affect proficiency on the state standardized test. Therefore, zero was entered in both columns.	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
2	The strategies incorporated by the schools include the following research based practices: tiered reading instruction; balanced assessment; differentiated instruction; standards based instruction; technology integration; and co teaching.	15	1	4	D	increased achievement- not necessarily 5% in each subgroup accountable for AYP
	not applicable					
	not applicable					
	not applicable					
	not applicable					
	not applicable					
	not applicable					
	not applicable					
Comments: #2-Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring was the only strategy WV used for the 1003(g) grants. We had not SEA set aside for 1003(a) money; therefore, this part is not applicable.						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies</p>

comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The effective strategies were shared with schools in State sponsored grant writing workshops. Additionally, professional development was provided to districts/schools in the identified strategies. This professional development was delivered in state Title I district directors' conferences; on site professional development for the identified schools; summer academies; and through on site contracted consultants.

Dissemination of Information to Other LEAs

West Virginia is comprised of 55 districts or local education agencies each of which receives Title I, Part A funding. At a minimum of semiannually, the Title I director from each of these districts attends a state department conference to receive program updates and research focused professional development. This provides an avenue for disseminating information to other LEAs within the state regarding positive examples of LEAs and schools who have effectively implemented school improvement strategies supported with school improvement funding (e.g., recognition from state Title I coordinators, presentation from successful schools, viewing videos focusing on method replication, etc.). Other methods of communicating this information to LEAs include the use of the state website, e-mail, and newsletter articles.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 0.0 %

Comments: WV was not able to set aside money for school improvement 1003(a) due to the hold harmless provision.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to assess the individual program effectiveness, the LEA and school administrative staff will be expected to assist the school improvement team in developing a high-quality professional development plan and to monitor classroom teachers to ensure the selected strategies are being implemented consistently and pervasively within all classrooms. The staff must annually evaluate the implementation of the school improvement program and measure the results in the improvement of student achievement. The evaluation must reflect a "balanced" assessment approach -a combination of formative and summative processes. The evaluation must demonstrate school progress towards achieving defined measurable goals and benchmarks and address how adjustments and improvements will be made as necessary to school improvement strategies. Changes in the school improvement plan should be made when data indicates technical assistance or a strategy or combination of strategies are not having the intended result. Moreover, accountability for the evaluation will be ensured by the annual evaluation report being submitted to the WVDE Title I coordinator for school improvement.

Monitoring The SEA will monitor the effectiveness of the technical assistance provided by the LEA through its statewide system of three year cyclical monitoring and annual visits to Title I schools identified for improvement. One indicator on the LEA monitoring instrument requires districts to provide documentation of the type of assistance and the dates of technical assistance provided to identified Title I schools. Additionally, all district Title I directors are required to attend the SEA sponsored meetings for Title I schools identified for improvement as part of a school team. Each Title I school receives an on-site visit during the cyclical monitoring. The annual evaluation of the implementation of the school improvement program and measures of the results in improving academic achievement for all students will also be used for monitoring. Changes in the school improvement plan should be made when data indicates technical assistance or a strategy or combination of strategies are not having the intended result. Increases in other activities that lead to increased student achievement such as greater parental involvement and teacher collaboration will also be considered.

Additional monitoring and accountability will be applied to the grants for the technology integration specialists. Accountability for this position is determined through the utilization of the following methods:

- Monthly activity reports; E-Portfolios
- Pre/Post TIS Professional Development Surveys
- School Assessment for the Integration of Technology Monitoring Instruments
- Onsite classroom observation and monitoring
- Trend analysis of targeted needs and student achievement from year to year
- Presentation Showcase: A Year in Review Multi-Media Project focusing on technology integration and 21st century learning in the school and district.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable -West Virginia does not have additional funding allocated to Title I schools identified for improvement.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	9,356
Applied to transfer	67
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	67

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments: Information for students who transferred in a prior year and the current year is not available, as WVDE does not maintain records of the names of students who have transferred.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 58,325
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	3
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³

b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	6,922
Applied for supplemental educational services	176
Received supplemental educational services	176
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 134,055
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	109,518	99,644	91.0	9,874	9.0
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	17,885	17,336	96.9	549	3.1
Low-poverty schools	9,114	8,858	97.2	256	2.8
All elementary schools	44,490	43,237	97.2	1,253	2.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	4,655	3,908	84.0	747	16.0
Low-poverty schools	32,499	28,127	86.5	4,372	13.5
All secondary schools	65,028	56,407	86.7	8,621	13.3
Comments:					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	Yes
---	-----

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Teacher's scheduled to teach a "self-contained" class covering all subjects to the same group of students all day were counted as six individual classes.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	46.2
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	41.7
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	50.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	46.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	3.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	59.3	41.7
Poverty metric used	Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. These determinations were made based on the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	66.5	45.5
Poverty metric used	Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. These determinations were made based on the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch.	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
No	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	1,615
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	1,211
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	805
Arabic	112
Chinese Mandarin	89
Vietnamese	51
Russian	43

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,202
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	413
Total	1,615
Comments: There were actually 1,469 student reports on the state's ELP assessment. However, 52 students had incomplete test records that did not result in a Composite score (therefore they were not included in the 1,202 number tested. Additionally, 117 students participated in the assessment, but did not have an active LEP file at the time of collection (due to moving out of state or withdrawing from school etc.) so we were unable to include match them back to a particular school system for accountability.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	54
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3.3
Comments: According to West Virginia's current procedures for calculating "Proficient" and the state's current definition of cohort, only those students with 2 years of data AND those students that were at a "3" or above in prior years are included in the AMAO 2 cohort. Using these criteria, there were 110 students in the AMAO 2 cohort. Out of those 110 students in the AMAO 2 Cohort, 54 (49%) met the AMAO 2 target. Thus 49% were proficient. HOWEVER, the percentage field in CSPR automatically calculates to 3.3%. We are aware that this definition will need to be revised based on the recent guidance from OELA. However, currently, the correct percentage should be 49%	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,161
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	398
Total	1,559
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	613	70.0
ELP attainment	53	49.0

Comments: According to West Virginia's current procedures for calculating "Making Progress" and the state's current definition of cohort, only those students with 2 years of data are included in the AMAO 1 cohort. Using these criteria, there were 878 (Title III Served) students in the AMAO 1 cohort. Out of those 878 students in the AMAO 1 Title III Cohort, 613 (70%) met the AMAO 1 target. Thus 70% Made Progress. Regarding AMAO 2, according to West Virginia's current procedures for calculating "Proficient" and the state's current definition of cohort, only those students with 2 years of data AND those students that were at a "3" or above in prior years are included in the AMAO 2 cohort. Using these criteria, there were 108 (Title III Served) students in the AMAO 2 cohort. Out of those 108 students in the AMAO 2 Cohort, 53 (49%) met the AMAO 2 target. Thus 49% were proficient. We are aware that this definition will need to be revised based on the recent guidance from OELA.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
27	N<10	29
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
29	29	100.0	0
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
29	29		
Comments: Automatic calculation didn't happen on this page			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
29	29		
Comments: Same as above			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	24
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	24
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
Comments: West Virginia's current AMAO calculations are based on the process and performance targets that were submitted to USDOE on April 12, 2008. They are available at http://wvconnections.k12.wv.us/documents/AttachATitleIIIAccountabilityWVB.doc Using these processes, the state applied the set targets to all 7 Individual Title III grantees as well as the 3 Consortia. Consortia districts were calculated both in calculations combined at the consortia level, as well as individually (17 total). Using either method of calculations, all consortia districts met AMAOs. Thus the state reported 24 total districts (7 individual + 17 consortia members) as having met AMAOs.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,599	545	2

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	42
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	25

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **# Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. **Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.**
4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	15	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	12	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	8	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	9	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	12	2,486
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	168
PD provided to principals	11	223
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	11	220
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	8	923
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	102
Total	58	4,122

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/08	09/17/08	71
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For 2008, the state of West Virginia totally revised its online 5 Year Strategic Plan Application process for federal funds. Since many districts were relearning the revised online process, there were some initial delays that we anticipate will be eliminated next year. In addition, since the state received an increase in Title III funds, the initial per student allocation projected by the state had to be revised. Therefore, many districts that successfully completed the application process had to go back and revise upward their budget portion.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	98.3
Black, non-Hispanic	81.8
Hispanic	78.4
White, non-Hispanic	84.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	73.1
Limited English proficient	90.8
Economically disadvantaged	74.2
Migratory students	
Male	83.1
Female	86.3
Comments: Correct as reported	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3.3
Hispanic	2.6
White, non-Hispanic	2.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.7
Limited English proficient	1.3
Economically disadvantaged	3.7
Migratory students	0.0
Male	3.0
Female	2.4
Comments: No migratory students dropped....there are VERY FEW in the state	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	41	35
LEAs with subgrants	14	13
Total	55	48
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	115	174
1	108	166
2	106	155
3	102	163
4	78	144
5	88	124
6	85	135
7	72	138
8	71	138
9	138	134
10	93	102
11	55	86
12	49	90
Ungraded	0	0
Total	1,160	1,749
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	332	446
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	678	1,035
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	100	189
Hotels/Motels	50	79
Total	1,160	1,749
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	30
K	110
1	109
2	136
3	112
4	102
5	96
6	112
7	98
8	99
9	84
10	49
11	47
12	48
Ungraded	
Total	1,232
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	97
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	281
Limited English proficient students	N<10
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	13
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	5
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	5
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	5
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional – in comment box below)	4
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School Selection	
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for NCLB.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	73	50
4	67	50
5	64	34
6	67	51
7	53	35
8	50	36
High School	38	23
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	73	46
4	67	50
5	64	40
6	67	44
7	53	28
8	50	35
High School	38	21
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	0
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	55
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

West Virginia has struggled with efforts to identify migrant families, but is doing much better since hiring a migrant recruiter in June of 2008. Largely through the efforts of this recruiter, West Virginia has been able to identify this increased number of migrant children

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	18
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

West Virginia has struggled with efforts to identify migrant families, but is doing much better since hiring a migrant recruiter in June of 2008. Largely through the efforts of this recruiter, West Virginia has been able to identify and therefore serve this increased number of migrant children.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

West Virginia's count is so low the numbers were manually calculated based on COE's and summer school information from the counties. This is the same manner in which the numbers were generated for the previous reporting period. The eligibility information, such as the information about the qualifying move and the activities that make the move a qualifying move, are found on the COE. The data such as name, age, dob, school enrollment date, parents name, address, phone number, etc., are found on the COE and are also entered in the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS). During this reporting period, September 1, 2007 -August 31, 2008, there was no mechanism in place in WVEIS to capture any data specific to migrant students other than a field that identified a student as being a migrant student. All information pertaining to why the student qualified as a migrant student was kept only on the COE. Therefore, all information used to generate the counts in this report was taken from the COE and then qualifying students (based on COE information) were checked against records from the LEA to determine which of the eligible children actually received services. This is possible because we have a total of 55 identified students with approximately 40 COEs.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MEP recruiter recruits migrant children through personal interviews (face-to-face), and the same recruiter updates existing COE information through a verification process including telephone and face-to-face visits. Results of interviews—student demographics and eligibility information--are recorded on a standard COE (paper) The child data collected on the COE is the child's school WVEIS number, school name, child's name, child's WVEIS #, sex, dob, birthplace, verification of birth, ethnicity, grade and if the child has had an educational interruption. Family data collected include legal male and female parents' names, current male and female parents' names, current address and phone number. Eligibility data include moved from, moved to, qualifying arrival date (QAD), residency date, and enrollment date. Participation in summer programs is determined by the same recruiter through personal observation and collaboration with the LEA Title I director.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During this reporting period, the only information collected for migrant students in the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS) that is in addition to the data that is stored for all students is a "tag" that identifies the student as having been identified as a migrant student. Using this tag, a list of students identified as migrant in the WVEIS database is generated by the SEA using data current after the second month report (October). That list is given to the state MEP director. The director then works with the recruiter to verify that each of the students listed has a current COE by comparing the list of students generated from WVEIS with the actual COE's. The COE's are kept in the possession of the recruiter. The recruiter meets with the state director and together they check eligibility status of students identified in WVEIS. The eligibility status of students that do not have a current COE is checked by the recruiter through personal contact and reports their status to the state MEP director. The state MEP director notifies LEA Title I directors in LEAs having students enrolled who have been misidentified in WVEIS as being migrant students to remove the migrant identifier from those students' records. Also, if there are students who have a COE and are not identified in WVEIS, notice is sent to the LEA's Title I director to apply the migrant identifier in WVEIS for those students. The SEA is currently developing a way to capture all of the data available from the COE that is not already entered in WVEIS.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data collected in the same manner.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity); These numbers were found by examining each of the COE's and counting the number of children who had a move date within 36 months prior to August 31, 2008.
- Children who were between age 3 through 21; There was no compilation or editing function built into the WVEIS system for editing this data at the time of collection period (September 1, 2007 -August 31, 2008). The count was found by examining each of the COE's and counting the number of children in this category based on their date of birth.
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31); There was no compilation or editing function built into the WVEIS system for at the time of this data collection period (September 1, 2007 - August 31, 2008). The count was found by examining each of the COE's and counting the number of children in this category based on the date of their move
- Data collection
- * A home visit is conducted with a family each year to confirm residency, and/or
- * MEP/LEA staff check school/program attendance records or data to confirm residency
- The migrant recruiter has on-going contact with the families she has identified with on the COE's. Her personal knowledge of each family's situation and her knowledge of each of the students' participation in the program components allows us to be sure of our accuracy in generating these counts.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; There was no compilation or editing function built into the WVEIS system for for this data at the time of this collection period (September 1, 2007 -August 31, 2008). The count was found by examining the list of children who participated in the summer program and verifying each child was eligible based on informati on the COE .
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category. There was no compilation or editing function built into the WVEIS system for this data at the time of this collection period (September 1, 2007 -August 31, 2008). The count was found by examining each of the COE's and counting the number of children in this category based on the grade level information on the COE
- State data collection service -West Virginia Educational Information Service (WVEIS)
- * Students are assigned unique identification numbers.
- * Centralized databases:

1. An ongoing procedure is used to determine whether a student already has a record in the database prior to inputting Student data into the system.
2. Once in the system, an on-going procedure is used to ensure that duplicate records are identified and eliminated.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data collected in the same manner.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) that is used statewide. Student eligibility is based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult. The migrant recruiter conducts interviews with the adults present in the home. This is accomplished through multiple visits. Data is not recorded on the COE until the recruiter is satisfied the data is truthful and correct.

The SEA student data collection system (WVEIS) is currently creating a method for capturing the data generated from the COE that is different from the usual data collected for all students. The SEA will also build edit functions into the system specifically designed to produce an accurate child count. SEA will also be looking at methods of ensuring accuracy with the data collected on the COE's. This process is ongoing, and was not in place at all during this reporting period.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The recruiter visits/interviews each family three times before data is certified on the COE. Also, due to our extremely low numbers, the recruiter is able to maintain a personal relationship with each of the identified families and each family is re-visited at least once per quarter. As prospective re-interviewing was not required by regulation for '07-'08, an independent re-interviewing process had not been established.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state director receives a report from the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS) annually after the 2nd month (October) of the reporting period with all of the students who are tagged as migrant in the WVEIS system. The director and the recruiter work together to compare the students named in WVEIS with the COE records. Records are updated to reflect the actual situations.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because of the small number of identified students and the familiarity of the recruiter with the families and the students who have participated in the summer school and extended day programs, the counts for category 1 and category 2 are all verified on a case by case basis.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The recruiter is currently investigating other areas of the state that are likely to contain migrant families. We will be actively seeking to qualify children from these areas as well as continuing with our efforts in the counties we currently have identified qualifying students. The SEA is confident that the counts reported based on the data collected on the COE's are absolutely accurate. The possible inaccuracy of the count lies in the fact there may be more children in WV who are eligible to be served, but who have not yet been identified

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA is very confident of the accuracy of the reported child counts in the sense that those counted are indeed qualified. However, we are concerned that there may be a significant number of children who could qualify if we were aware of them. Our recruiter is doing a wonderful job, but has so far been limited to a small geographical region of the state. We are attempting to expand our count to more counties throughout West Virginia.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.