

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 2008-09

VIRGINIA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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

Address:
P. O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218-2120

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Ms. Roberta Schlicher, Director of Program Administration and Accountability

Telephone: (804) 225-2870

Fax: (804) 371-7347

e-mail: Roberta.Schlicher@doe.virginia.gov

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

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Friday, March 12, 2010, 9:59:02 AM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) were originally developed and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in June 1995. Following the schedule established by the Virginia Board of Education for revision of all content standards, the revised mathematics content standards were approved by the Board on February 19, 2009, and are scheduled to be implemented beginning with fall 2011. The science content standards and the English/reading content standards are scheduled to be approved by the Board in January 2010 with an implementation schedule to be determined after Board approval.

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.

Virginia's mathematics assessments, including the alternate assessment for students with disabilities who are pursuing alternate achievement standards and the grade level alternatives, will be revised in 2012 to reflect the revised mathematics content standards adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2009. New cut scores for the revised tests will be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2012.

Virginia's reading assessments, including the alternate assessment for students with disabilities who are pursuing alternate achievement standards and the grade level alternatives, will be revised in 2013 to reflect the revised English/reading content standards scheduled to be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2010. New cut scores for the revised tests will be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2013.

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 4,000 characters.

Virginia's science assessments, including the alternate assessment for students with disabilities who are pursuing alternate achievement standards and the grade level alternatives, will be revised in 2013 to reflect the revised science content standards scheduled to be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2010. New cut scores for the revised tests will be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2013.
--

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 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 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 ESEA. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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	768,428		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,364		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	44,810		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	203,360		>97%
Hispanic	66,345		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	451,549		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	93,067		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	52,277		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	250,607		>97%
Migratory students	252		>97%
Male	389,246		>97%
Female	379,182		>97%
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. 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(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	33,170	35.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	36,555	39.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	16,055	17.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,641	7.2
Total	92,421	
Comments:		

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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	634,694		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,933		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	36,483		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	167,035		>97%
Hispanic	53,823		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	375,420		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	82,184		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	42,708		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	211,659		>97%
Migratory students	220		>97%
Male	323,756		>97%
Female	310,938		>97%
Comments:			

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 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 (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	37,753	46.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	20,619	25.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	16,823	20.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,627	8.1
Total	81,822	
Comments:		

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 science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	517,645		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,584		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	30,097		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	136,131		>97%
Hispanic	42,947	41,133	95.8
White, non-Hispanic	306,886		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	59,182		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,690	29,204	92.2
Economically disadvantaged students	162,379		>97%
Migratory students	152	139	91.5
Male	260,949		>97%
Female	256,696		>97%
Comments:			

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

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 science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	26,875	46.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,502	44.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,812	3.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,664	6.3
Total	57,853	
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). 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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,241	81,649	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	223	195	87.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,568	5,239	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	24,094	19,304	80.1
Hispanic	8,797	7,133	81.1
White, non-Hispanic	53,559	49,778	92.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,317	9,398	76.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,859	7,005	79.1
Economically disadvantaged students	35,136	28,484	81.1
Migratory students	47	39	83.0
Male	47,228	41,780	88.5
Female	45,013	39,869	88.6
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.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,010	79,220	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	196	86.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,452	5,028	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	24,134	18,770	77.8
Hispanic	8,666	7,153	82.5
White, non-Hispanic	53,532	48,073	89.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,329	8,974	72.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,479	6,912	81.5
Economically disadvantaged students	34,995	27,406	78.3
Migratory students	46	31	67.4
Male	47,119	39,622	84.1
Female	44,891	39,598	88.2
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.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,709	79,435	88.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	226	197	87.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,143	4,800	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,766	18,801	79.1
Hispanic	7,323	5,978	81.6
White, non-Hispanic	53,251	49,659	93.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,709	8,675	74.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,550	5,183	79.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33,365	26,698	80.0
Migratory students	34	26	76.5
Male	45,883	40,712	88.7
Female	43,826	38,723	88.4
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.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,656	78,107	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	259	214	82.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,263	4,909	93.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,926	18,617	77.8
Hispanic	8,279	6,379	77.1
White, non-Hispanic	52,929	47,988	90.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,233	9,090	74.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,658	5,649	73.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,934	26,203	77.2
Migratory students	38	25	65.8
Male	46,421	40,116	86.4
Female	44,235	37,991	85.9
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.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,424	80,187	88.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	264	233	88.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,135	4,798	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,848	19,458	81.6
Hispanic	8,146	6,924	85.0
White, non-Hispanic	53,031	48,774	92.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,230	9,492	77.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,272	6,016	82.7
Economically disadvantaged students	33,761	27,433	81.3
Migratory students	38	30	79.0
Male	46,321	40,428	87.3
Female	44,103	39,759	90.2
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.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 4.			

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.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	86,342	77,455	89.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	277	247	89.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,612	4,377	94.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,594	19,781	83.8
Hispanic	7,790	6,558	84.2
White, non-Hispanic	50,069	46,492	92.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,795	9,247	78.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,140	5,778	80.9
Economically disadvantaged students	32,568	27,108	83.2
Migratory students	34	28	82.4
Male	44,283	39,541	89.3
Female	42,059	37,914	90.1
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.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,272	82,593	91.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	289	266	92.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,259	5,049	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic	23,997	20,614	85.9
Hispanic	7,833	6,922	88.4
White, non-Hispanic	52,894	49,742	94.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,933	9,522	79.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,932	6,009	86.7
Economically disadvantaged students	32,721	27,955	85.4
Migratory students	32	25	78.1
Male	46,357	41,736	90.0
Female	43,915	40,857	93.0
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.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,399	79,226	87.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	289	267	92.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,353	4,872	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	23,954	18,862	78.7
Hispanic	7,932	6,083	76.7
White, non-Hispanic	52,871	49,142	93.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,813	8,240	69.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,233	5,019	69.4
Economically disadvantaged students	32,813	25,616	78.1
Migratory students	33	22	66.7
Male	46,414	41,091	88.5
Female	43,985	38,135	86.7
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.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,573	57,790	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	255	186	72.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,157	3,584	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	21,681	13,117	60.5
Hispanic	7,544	4,719	62.6
White, non-Hispanic	45,936	36,184	78.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,337	6,821	60.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,483	3,818	58.9
Economically disadvantaged students	28,390	17,064	60.1
Migratory students	31	22	71.0
Male	40,750	29,212	71.7
Female	38,823	28,578	73.6
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	88,953	76,649	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	277	247	89.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,177	4,837	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,048	17,575	76.3
Hispanic	7,809	6,300	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	52,642	47,690	90.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,588	8,054	69.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,458	4,993	77.3
Economically disadvantaged students	29,585	22,626	76.5
Migratory students	31	22	71.0
Male	45,570	38,280	84.0
Female	43,383	38,369	88.4
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.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 6.			

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.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,974	46,756	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	153	73.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,347	2,760	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	18,045	10,268	56.9
Hispanic	6,308	3,709	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	38,065	29,866	78.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,635	6,782	63.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,323	2,886	54.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,272	14,354	59.1
Migratory students	21	12	57.1
Male	33,830	23,704	70.1
Female	32,144	23,052	71.7
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.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,021	79,612	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	291	253	86.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,136	4,824	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,455	18,763	80.0
Hispanic	7,596	6,225	82.0
White, non-Hispanic	53,543	49,547	92.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,629	8,406	72.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,610	4,242	75.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,213	23,202	79.4
Migratory students	28	18	64.3
Male	45,925	39,818	86.7
Female	44,096	39,794	90.2
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.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Virginia does not administer the Standards of Learning assessments in science for grade 7.			

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.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	84,392	71,981	85.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	267	233	87.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,537	4,262	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,274	17,998	77.3
Hispanic	7,387	5,621	76.1
White, non-Hispanic	48,927	43,867	89.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,559	8,895	70.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,234	3,635	69.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,280	21,642	76.5
Migratory students	26	23	88.5
Male	43,767	36,555	83.5
Female	40,625	35,426	87.2
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	91,949	80,394	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	319	279	87.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,016	4,726	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	24,338	19,201	78.9
Hispanic	7,547	6,083	80.6
White, non-Hispanic	54,729	50,105	91.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,590	8,647	68.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,932	3,624	73.5
Economically disadvantaged students	29,364	22,928	78.1
Migratory students	27	23	85.2
Male	47,073	40,450	85.9
Female	44,876	39,944	89.0
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.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,433	81,702	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	305	287	94.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,044	4,774	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,756	19,663	82.8
Hispanic	7,563	6,028	79.7
White, non-Hispanic	53,765	50,950	94.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,634	7,996	68.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,163	3,535	68.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,696	23,252	81.0
Migratory students	25	17	68.0
Male	46,167	41,648	90.2
Female	44,266	40,054	90.5
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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	266,090	241,269	90.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	865	793	91.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,243	16,534	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	67,369	56,201	83.4
Hispanic	19,855	17,102	86.1
White, non-Hispanic	160,758	150,639	93.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,545	16,419	76.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,356	9,638	84.9
Economically disadvantaged students	66,475	56,076	84.4
Migratory students	54	46	85.2
Male	131,183	118,535	90.4
Female	134,907	122,734	91.0
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.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,665	85,380	95.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	255	96.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,264		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	23,568	21,393	90.8
Hispanic	6,112	5,657	92.6
White, non-Hispanic	54,456		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,523	7,604	79.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,933	2,487	84.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21,257	19,176	90.2
Migratory students	18	14	77.8
Male	44,538	42,174	94.7
Female	45,127	43,206	95.7
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.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	241,610	214,588	88.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	749	685	91.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,036	13,067	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	63,022	49,813	79.0
Hispanic	18,315	14,419	78.7
White, non-Hispanic	145,488	136,604	93.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,697	15,134	66.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,258	6,946	67.7
Economically disadvantaged students	64,148	49,909	77.8
Migratory students	47	34	72.3
Male	119,443	106,838	89.5
Female	122,167	107,750	88.2
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.

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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,860	1,337	71.9
Districts	133	60	45.1
Comments: The EDEN files submitted to ED Facts by Virginia Department of Education are not correctly pre-populating in this table. Virginia Department of Education staff have been in contact with EDEN Partner Support to resolve the issue. The correct number of LEA's for Virginia is 132 school divisions not 133.			

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 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	711	514	72.3
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	376	274	72.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	335	240	71.6
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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
132	60	45.5
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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- 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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	7
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	5
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
Comments:	

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	2
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	7
Comments:	

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.

The activities conducted by schools in their second year of restructuring under "other major restructuring of the school governance" are as follows:

- Participated in biweekly or monthly assistance from alternative governance committees;
- Participated in on-site assistance from administrative and/or core academic coaches;
- Focused attention on data use and analysis through a required Restructuring Quarterly Report located on the Office of School Improvement's Web site at:
<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/>;
- Focused attention on central office/division-level assistance to schools in restructuring through the Center on Innovation and Improvement's online school improvement planning tool delivered via WebEx by a trained faculty member. More detailed information is located at: <http://www.centerii.org/aboutus/>;
- Focused attention on school improvement team/school-level assistance to schools in restructuring through the Center on Innovation and Improvement's online school improvement planning tool delivered via WebEx by a trained faculty member. More detailed information is located at: <http://www.centerii.org/aboutus/>;
- Participated in core academic technical assistance for administrators and teachers from the Virginia Department of Education;
- Appointed a new school administration;

Revised/aligned the division/school curriculum pacing guides and conducted trainings;

Increased classroom monitoring strategies; and

Implemented school reform strategies proven successful in Virginia's Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) initiative.

More detailed information is located at: <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/SchoolImprovement/pass.html>.

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2009-10 (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.

Virginia had no divisions identified as in improvement or corrective action. The Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook amended May 2009 states: Virginia will identify divisions for improvement only when they do not make AYP in the "same subject area or both other academic indicators" and all grade spans for two consecutive years. (p. 27) This identification process resulted in no divisions being identified as in improvement for 2009-2010.

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
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 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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 SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	17	10
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	10/21/09
---	----------

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 2008-09.

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 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	23,604	21,814
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	18,422	16,575
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	78.1	76.0
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	22,993	21,442
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	18,536	16,903
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 2008-09	80.6	78.8
Comments:		

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

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 2008-09 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 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	41
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	17
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	46
Comments:	

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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

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 based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, 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.
5	Improve teaching and learning by the hiring of coaches to: 1) provide professional development through workshops on literacy and mathematics instruction, planning and assessments; 2) collaboratively plan lessons with selected teachers; 3) interpret diagnostic assessments; 4) collect data to evaluate programs for instructional decision-making and monitoring of student progress; and 5) provide learning opportunities for parents through meetings and workshops.	7	2	2	A	

6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1 and 5 comprise this combination.	41	8	21	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 4 and 5 comprise this combination.	7	2	4	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 1, 4, and 5 comprise this combination.	19	5	9	A	

Comments:

Column 1 Response Options Box

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.

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.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

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.

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.

6 = Combination 1: 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.

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 Virginia Department of Education has taken a comprehensive approach to providing school divisions with the opportunity to share effective strategies they have implemented with 1003(g) funds. For the 2008-2009 school year, school divisions participated in the following professional development opportunities: 1) a series of on-site training sessions throughout the school year that focused on analyzing data and revising school improvement plans to address areas of need; 2) monthly webinars that focused on the status of school improvement plan implementation; and 3) a weeklong summer institute that provided training for coaches and school division personnel in the implementation of the state's coaching model. An opportunity for school divisions to share effective strategies is a component of each of the professional development opportunities described above.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

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 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has worked collaboratively with the National Content Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII), the Virginia Foundation for Educational Leadership (VFEL), and the Appalachia Regional Comprehensive Center (ARCC) at Edvantia to develop a comprehensive system of evaluation and technical assistance for the implementation of the 1003(g) grants. The allowable five percent set aside of the 1003(g) funds were used for technical assistance. The technical assistance as described below was provided to all grantees in development and implementation of their grant applications.

The technical assistance related to development of the grant applications was provided through both webinars and audio conferences. The focus of the webinars and audio conferences was to ensure that the school divisions receiving the grants understood the requirements of the grant application, the timeline for submission, and the process that would be used to review the applications.

The technical assistance related to implementation of the 1003(g) grants was provided through webinars and on-site professional development opportunities. The focus of the webinars was based on the information the grantees entered into the CII Rapid Improvement Indicators Web-based tool. The tool requires grantees to develop a Web-based school improvement plan and provide monthly updates regarding the progress the school is making in implementation of the plan. VDOE staff and trained VFEL consultants review the information submitted by the schools and conduct monthly webinars to discuss progress and provide technical assistance. Additionally, all grantees participated in a series of three two-day on-site professional development sessions during the school year that focused on analyzing data and adjusting their school improvement plans as a result of their analysis. Finally, all grantees participated in a weeklong summer professional development institute that provided training for coaches and school division personnel in the implementation of the state's coaching model. The training was developed and implemented through the CII, VFEL, and ARCC partnership.

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

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 2008-09 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.

Technical Assistance Title I schools identified for School Improvement that are also considered "warned" under the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (SOA) receive assistance through state funds. The assistance is delivered through the tiered academic review process which provides targeted technical assistance based on level of need. Tier 1 provides the least amount of technical assistance while Tier 3 provides the greatest amount of technical assistance. Divisions with low-performing schools are assigned a tier and receive assistance based on their level of need as described below.

Tier 1 Intervention In this tier, schools receive an enhanced academic review and are assigned a school support team. The support team consists of experts in the content area(s) and or subgroup(s) with which the school is struggling.

Tier 2 Intervention In this tier, schools receive coaches that have been trained in the Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) model. The PASS model was developed by educators and is based on models of intervention that have been successful with low-performing schools. PASS coaches customize the technical assistance based on the individual needs of the school in improvement.

Tier 3 Intervention In this tier, school divisions are assigned a chief academic officer. The chief academic officer serves as an on-site academic coach to the entire division. The technical assistance provided is customized based on the needs of the division.

State-level staff members from the Office of School Improvement work closely with the schools, divisions, and the assigned support system for each tier.

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

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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	44,450
Applied to transfer	847
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	813

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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,404,627

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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	8

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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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	21,510
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,368
Received supplemental educational services	4,769
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	\$ 5,226,253
Comments:	

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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	215,161	211,659	98.4	3,502	1.6
All elementary classes	51,205	50,553	98.7	652	1.3
All secondary classes	163,956	161,106	98.3	2,850	1.7

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.

Elementary classes are counted so that a full-day, self-contained classroom equals one class.

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 is 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 the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

In the tables 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	70.0
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	20.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	66.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	16.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	18.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	11,953	11,716	98.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	14,262	14,129	99.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	23,369	22,420	95.9
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	55,360	54,881	99.1

1.5.4 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	60.1	22.4
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	50.3	20.3
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
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
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other types of programs include: collaboration; inclusion; virtual ESL classes; support for parents; afterschool tutoring; and newcomer programs.

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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	97,139
Comments:	

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 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.	96,890
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; Castilian	58,599
Korean	4,331
Arabic	3,981
Vietnamese	3,811
Urdu	2,843

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the 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	97,139
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	97,139
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	13,601
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	14.0
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	96,890
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	96,890
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	24,039

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	0	0.0		45.00
ELP attainment	13,539	100.0		35.00

Comments: In March 2008, the United States Department of Education (USED) approved Virginia's request to calculate and make determinations for the Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for the 2008-2009 school year using AMAO 2 (attainment) and AMAO 3 (adequate yearly progress for the LEP subgroup). The approval of the request was granted because Virginia adopted a new English language proficiency (ELP) assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. As a result of the statewide implementation of a new ELP assessment AMAO1 (progress) cannot be calculated until data are available from two administrations of the new ELP assessment. In the chart above, the EDEN system is not allowing the data for making progress and ELP attainment to be calculated as permitted in the waiver granted by USED. The number and percentage of LEP students should not be calculated. The line containing the data related to making progress should be blank. The results for making progress cannot be calculated until the data are available from two administrations of the new ELP assessment. In the line containing the data for ELP attainment, the number of students, 13,539, is correct, but the percentage is not calculated correctly. The percentage should be 14 percent.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 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
7,706	5,931	13,637
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
11,742	10,531	89.7	1,211
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of 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 1.6.3.6.3 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
9,568	8,930	93.3	638
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 total 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
7,725	6,973	90.3	752
Comments:			

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	126
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	126
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	112
# -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 2007-08 and 2008-09)	1
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
Comments: In March 2008, the United States Department of Education (USED) approved Virginia's request to calculate and make determinations for the Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for the 2008-2009 school year using AMAO 2 (attainment) and AMAO 3 (adequate yearly progress for the LEP subgroup). The approval of the request was granted because Virginia adopted a new English language proficiency (ELP) assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. As a result of the statewide implementation of a new ELP assessment AMAO1 (progress) cannot be calculated until data are available from two administrations of the new ELP assessment.	

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>No</u>
Comments: In March 2008, the United States Department of Education (USED) approved Virginia's request to calculate and make determinations for the Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for the 2008-2009 school year using AMAO 2 (attainment) and AMAO 3 (adequate yearly progress for the LEP subgroup). The approval of the request was granted because Virginia adopted a new English language proficiency (ELP) assessment for the 2008-2009 school year. As a result of the statewide implementation of a new ELP assessment AMAO1 (progress) cannot be calculated until data are available from two administrations of the new ELP assessment.	

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:	

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 schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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
26,969	22,389	32

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: C SPR & 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 under 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) û The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course û (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.	1,888
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	770

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.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet 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 activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	62	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	47	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	47	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	41	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	40	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	57	9,065
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	56	2,784
PD provided to principals	54	1,536
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	40	1,975
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	40	1,975
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	1,025
Total		18,360

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/02	08/18/20	40
Comments:		

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.

The Office of Program Administration and Accountability will continue to work to streamline the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. School divisions that submit an approved application by July 1 of the application submission year can access the funds for that year on a reimbursement basis beginning July 1.

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	
Comments: Virginia has no persistently dangerous schools.	

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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	71.9
Hispanic	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	84.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	43.6
Limited English proficient	64.7
Economically disadvantaged	67.6
Migratory students	84.9
Male	76.1
Female	84.0
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CS PR & 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 CS PR 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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2.8
Hispanic	3.6
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.4
Limited English proficient	3.7
Economically disadvantaged	2.4
Migratory students	3.5
Male	2.2
Female	1.6
Comments:	

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	103	103
LEAs with subgrants	29	29
Total	132	132
Comments:		

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)	121	287
K	420	935
1	360	890
2	353	867
3	300	838
4	293	774
5	264	704
6	248	662
7	223	675
8	238	600
9	249	732
10	149	496
11	128	378
12	142	442
Ungraded		
Total	3,488	9,280
Comments:		

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	790	1,757
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,132	6,066
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	129	364
Hotels/Motels	437	1,093
Total	3,488	9,280
Comments:		

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)	706
K	869
1	894
2	848
3	842
4	751
5	691
6	659
7	642
8	567
9	719
10	470
11	354
12	469
Ungraded	
Total	9,481
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	494
Migratory children/youth	55
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,572
Limited English proficient students	1,072
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	22
Expedited evaluations	10
Staff professional development and awareness	27
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	21
Transportation	23
Early childhood programs	15
Assistance with participation in school programs	18
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	17
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	19
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	23
Coordination between schools and agencies	23
Counseling	19
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	19
Clothing to meet a school requirement	21
School supplies	29
Referral to other programs and services	26
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	21
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	4
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Two subgrantees reported intensive case management and four subgrantees reported regional coordination.

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	8
School Selection	7
Transportation	10
School records	4
Immunizations	6
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One subgrant reported excessive transiency and one reported difficulty obtaining school record from the other states.

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 ESEA 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 ESEA.

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	741	537
4	668	483
5	617	474
6	577	397
7	575	412
8	511	356
High School	338	298
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 ESEA 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	747	540
4	678	453
5	619	457
6	567	280
7	537	240
8	492	340
High School	922	734
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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 under 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	116
K	85
1	90
2	97
3	65
4	75
5	63
6	41
7	46
8	63
9	32
10	42
11	27
12	27
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	302
Total	1,171
Comments: Virginia has no migrant students under the classification of ungraded.	

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

The category 1 child count decreased compared to the previous year due to an overall decrease in migrant students.

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	72
K	48
1	74
2	77
3	48
4	58
5	46
6	33
7	30
8	38
9	24
10	24
11	20
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	134
Total	734
Comments: Virginia has no migrant students under the classification of ungraded.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts 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.

The category 2 child count decreased compared to the previous year due to an overall decrease in migrant students.

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.

Virginia used the MIS 2000 database system to generate the 2008-2009 category 1 and 2 child count. The database consists of core and additional data that represent the elements within the national Certificate of Eligibility (COE) used by recruiters and migrant coordinators around the state.

Virginia used the MIS 2000 database system to generate the 2007-2008 category 1 and category 2 child count.

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.

The migratory child count data are collected year-round from September 1, 2008, through August 31, 2009.

The data collected are found on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is divided into five sections: 1) parent data; 2) child data; 3) eligibility data; 4) verification; and 5) state specific data. The parent data include parent or guardian names as well as current and home addresses. The child data include name, birth date, type of documentation used to confirm birth date, gender, grade enrollment date, and service location. Virginia began using the national COE in the spring of 2009. Additional state required data were added to the national COE. This additional information included: immunization records and qualification for other services, such as ESL and special education, enrollment type and location, and home base school. The eligibility data for the 2008-2009 school year include the qualifying arrival date (QAD), the last qualifying move (LQM), qualifying activity, the category of the move (with, to join, or on own), and the residency date.

The method for documenting the C1 child count was the same as C2. Data on category 1 and 2 child counts are collected via the COE and the withdrawal form.

The activities used to collect data were: personal interviews, a review of school records, school record requests from previous schools, discussion and communication with previous and current school personnel, and/or telephone updates. The data were collected by recruiters and/or migrant coordinators. When migratory families are identified, COE forms are completed during an interview conducted by the recruiter. The recruiter submits the completed COE to the migrant coordinator who reviews the COE for accuracy and verifies the information within five business days. After verification, all COE forms are submitted to the data entry specialist at the regional office for a final verification before being entered into the state database (MIS 2000).

A system of cross checks is also implemented with the student information system in the school division. After the COE has been verified and eligibility determined, the recruiter and/or migrant coordinator works with the registrar or local student information systems specialist to ensure the child is flagged as migrant in the student database. A Superintendent's Memorandum entitled, Accurate Identification of Eligible Migrant Students, was released in early summer of 2009 to remind school divisions that a child may only be identified as migrant if there is a verified COE. The importance of accurate migrant student identification in the local student information systems was also emphasized. In addition, students enrolled in divisions are assigned a state testing identifier which is included on the COE. This number is used to cross-check assessment data and information in the state data base.

At the end of each semester/term or when a migrant child leaves, the program teacher/recruiter completes a withdrawal form. The

withdrawal form collects demographic data on the student as well as program services. The withdrawal form was updated for the 2007-2008 school year to collect additional data. Additional elements added include: 1) ESL services and LEP level; 2) referred services; and 3) achievement of GED. The teacher/recruiter indicates if and what type of instructional support or referred services the student received. Other data collected include ESL level and assessment data. The withdrawal form is submitted to the migrant coordinator who reviews it for accuracy before submitting to the migrant data specialist. The information is entered into the master database in MIS 2000 from the withdrawal form. If the student remains in the migrant program and receives services the next semester or school year, a new COE is completed at the start of the new semester. An interview with the family is conducted to check accuracy of the data on the original COE. Changes, if any, on the new COE are entered into the master database. If the student is not enrolled or available for revalidation, the student is removed from the current list of eligible students.

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.

The data are entered by the migrant data entry specialist at the regional migrant office. The data entry specialist is responsible for inputting and updating all data in the state database. The coordinator for each Migrant Education Program (MEP) in Virginia is required to send the following data to the data entry specialist: Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and withdrawal form.

The coordinators communicate with the data entry specialist regarding COE information submitted to ensure accuracy of new and existing student records. Student records are updated through withdrawal forms as well as changes to key data fields within the child data of the COE. In the COE, coordinators list students who are currently enrolled and update exiting information. Coordinators submit a separate withdrawal form upon a student's departure.

Coordinators and recruiters evaluate the accuracy and efficiency of the forms used to collect the data. Throughout the year, each MEP coordinator trains program staff as needed. Reports from the coordinators regarding identification certification participation and withdrawal are submitted throughout the school year. Local migrant coordinators review program eligibility and then forward the data to the data entry specialist who conducts a final review of eligibility. If the data entry specialist has concerns about eligibility, the state migrant education specialist is consulted and a final review is conducted.

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 method for documenting the category 2 child count is the same as the method for documenting the category 1 child count.

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.

The child count is calculated through the MIS 2000 system. The MIS 2000 database consists of core and additional data that are representative of the elements within the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) used by the migrant coordinators and recruiters around the state. The key data elements used to ensure accurate category 1 and category 2 child counts consist of the enrollment, withdrawal, residency, qualifying activity, and qualifying arrival date (QAD), as well as school history data that establish a child's presence during the year. The COE was revised in the spring of 2008 to collect accurate data that is required by MSIX, and then again in the spring of 2009 to collect data required for the national COE. The database also assigns students unique identification numbers in MIS 2000. In addition, Virginia collects the Virginia State Test Identifier (STI) on the COE. Virginia included the STI to allow linking of migrant student records to the Virginia Student Information System.

To maintain accurate counts of eligible students, the database recognizes migrant students who are between the ages of three and twenty-one as well as those who were previously enrolled. The database allows the data entry specialist to set parameters that eliminate students without adequate school history data as well as students whose three-year eligibility has expired from being included in the child count. Additional data fields, parent data, mother's maiden name, child's birthplace, birth date, age, home base, and identification number, are used to avoid duplication.

During the summer/intersession terms, coordinators are required to submit weekly attendance records to the regional office to ensure accurate counts for students participating in a summer program. Teachers, tutors, and/or migrant student advocates record attendance and/or services provided, and send the attendance/service reports to the coordinators who send the attendance data weekly to the migrant data specialist.

The migrant data specialist enters the attendance records into the MIS 2000 migrant data system. The system produces a monthly report that is sent to each school division's migrant coordinator for verification. If errors are found, the migrant coordinators notify the migrant data specialist. The migrant data specialist uses this information to compile the category 1 and category 2 child counts.

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.

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.

Virginia has several steps that are taken to ensure proper eligibility of children in the Migrant Education Program (MEP). Virginia uses a standard Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form statewide. Virginia revised the state COE to include data elements requested by the new Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) initiative, and now uses the national COE. Information collected within the COE is gathered by conducting interviews with the parents, guardians, or other adults legally responsible for the students, or the students themselves in the case of emancipated youth. The qualifying arrival date, residency date, qualifying activity, and withdrawal dates are examples of data elements within the COE used to determine whether a student held residency status during the reporting period.

Local recruiters and program coordinators initially review program eligibility via the COE and then forward the data to the data entry specialist who conducts a final review of eligibility. If the data entry specialist has concerns, the state migrant education specialist conducts a final review.

The COEs from each MEP are crosschecked for accuracy against the data elements in the state database at the regional office prior to being compiled into a state report. If questions arise concerning the data within the report, the data entry specialist verifies that the data are correct. All local MEP data are confirmed with the data entry specialist and forwarded to the state director at the Virginia Department of Education for final review and approval if needed or requested.

During the summer/intersession terms, coordinators are required to submit weekly attendance/service records to the regional office to ensure accurate counts. Procedures are provided to personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data for summer enrollees or for services provided to students not enrolled in a summer school. In addition, a manual crosscheck is done from information gathered from the MIS 2000 database system and COEs to eliminate within-state duplication.

The Virginia Migrant Education Identification and Recruitment Manual is provided for each recruiter. The manual contains information on eligibility, including federal definitions, temporary and seasonal work, qualifying activities, red flags for possible nonqualification, and agricultural activities in Virginia. The manual also contains information on recruitment, including recruiting out-of-school youth. As updates are made to the manual, statewide training is provided.

In addition, for the 2008-2009 school year, the Virginia Department of Education provided training on the VA COE in the fall, and then worked with the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) to provide training on the national COE.

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.

Virginia conducted prospective reinterviewing during the 2008-2009 school year. Following Section 200.89(b)(2) found in the Code of Federal Regulations effective August 28, 2008, Virginia sampled 50 COEs from the current year's eligibility pool. The COEs were randomly sampled from migrant education programs that had not previously been through a reinterview process, had large migrant populations, and newer recruiters. Recruiters not involved in the initial determination of eligibility were responsible for conducting the reinterviewing. Reinterviewing was conducted via face to face and phone interviews during the spring and summer of 2009.

Fifty (50) migrant families were randomly selected to go through the reinterview process. Forty-nine (49) families were reinterviewed. The migrant child associated with the 50th family is listed as missing and a police report was filed.

From the 49 reinterviews, 47 families were found to be eligible and 2 were found to not be eligible because of nonqualifying activities. These two children were removed from the migrant database at the local level and state level.

A standard instrument was used for the re-interviewing process. The standard instrument included all the required items to make eligibility determinations. Additionally, the re-interviewers were trained and provided guidance.

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.

Virginia Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff members take several steps to ensure that child count data are entered and updated accurately. Through "read only" capabilities on the MIS 2000 database, coordinators are required to monitor the student information

entered on the state database system to ensure correct records at both state and local levels. In addition, all coordinators have been trained on using MSIX, and can conduct data checks using the MSIX log-in.

Throughout the year, the MEP coordinators submit new COEs to the data entry specialist that reflect changes and/or revisions to student information within the COE. The state director also monitors and tracks the flow of data from the local and regional migrant programs to the Virginia conducts Title I, Part C, Federal Program Monitoring for division and regional Migrant Education Programs (MEP) on a five year cycle. As part of the monitoring process, Virginia monitors divisions and regional MEPs for record keeping activities. If the monitoring indicates that records are not being checked and crosschecked, corrective actions are taken.

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.

Throughout the year, state staff review reports to ensure accuracy of eligible students present during the current reporting period. The data entry specialist produces monthly participation reports that show participants in the regular and summer/intersession terms when determining the category 1 and category 2 child count. The MEP coordinators review the reports before data are submitted to the state director. If discrepancies are found, the data entry specialist and coordinators communicate to determine whether a correction is necessary. If clarification is needed, the state migrant director works with the Office of Migrant Education to determine eligibility. At the state level, migrant data from the MIS 2000 is crosschecked against the data from the state student information system to ensure accuracy. The same data elements are collected from the local migrant program coordinators as the U.S. Department of Education collects from states in the annual Consolidated State Performance Report.

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.

To improve eligibility determinations, the state provided two days of technical assistance on completing the new national COE, new definition of temporary, and a review of qualifying activities in the spring of 2009. All coordinators and recruiters were invited to attend. For coordinators and recruiters not able to attend, and those that wanted a refresher, a conference call was provided later in the summer.

For the fall of 2009, Virginia conducted a webinar for all recruiters and coordinators on the new COE, the new definition of temporary, and areas addressed during a recent federal monitoring visit.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of the child counts.