

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

WEST 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:

West Virginia

Address:

1900 Kanawha Blvd
Charleston, WV 25305

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Nancy Walker

Telephone: 304-558-8869

Fax: 304-558-3584

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

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

Steve Paine

Friday, March 12, 2010, 10:46:16 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.

In March, 2006 groups of West Virginia teachers, identified as masters of their content, were assembled to begin work on creating new, more rigorous Content Standards and Objectives. Before they began work, teachers were trained on the 21st Century Initiative and assessing Depth of Knowledge of an objective. The teachers looked at national and international standards and assessments and wrote Content Standards and Objectives and Performance Descriptors designed to ensure that West Virginia students would have the skills needed to achieve at high levels.

Upon completion of the CSOs, the Department sought external state and national reviews and comment. The CSOs were reviewed by a variety of groups and experts comprised of local and national business and community members and content experts. The National 21st Century Partnership reviewed the CSOs and provided feedback to the Department for improvement based on 21st century content, rigor, and context. Additionally, Dr Norman Webb of the University of Wisconsin reviewed the standards to determine the Depth of Knowledge for each of the objectives and provide comments to the Department on how to increase the depth of rigor in the CSOs per grade level. These comments were studied and used to improve the quality of the grade level CSOs. A third review of the standards was compiled by Dr. William Schmidt of the University of Michigan which commented on the standards as they aligned to the TIMSS frameworks. The comments from the reviews were studied and adjustments to the CSOs were made when deemed appropriate.

After a number of revisions, the Content Standards and Objectives were placed on comment to West Virginia educators. All comments were collected and studied for final revisions. The CSOs were presented to and adopted by the WVBE. The state board approved Content Standards and Objectives, effective July 1, 2008, address the rigor and relevance requirements of a 21st century curriculum as recommended by the Partnership for 21st Century Skills and other reviewers. The comprehensive revisions and improvements to the standards will align education in West Virginia with the demands of the 21st century, providing students with the knowledge and skills to compete in a global economy.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) revised its student assessment program to measure a full range of knowledge and skills which incorporated multiple approaches to student assessments to improve record keeping on crucial learning outcomes of 21st century learning. The new assessments are aligned to the content, context, and learning tools of the 21st century, as defined by P21. The newly revised West Virginia Educational Standards Test (WESTEST 2), is a criterion-referenced test given in Grades 3-11 that measures student mastery of the 21st Century West Virginia Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) by the content area and grade level in mathematics and reading/language arts. In 2007, WVDE awarded CTB/McGraw-Hill the bid, in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP), to develop the next iteration of the WESTEST, called WESTEST 2, which is aligned with the revised mathematics and reading/language arts CSOs that include 21st century content, rigor, context, and learning skills. The alignment studies of these assessments to the new standards were completed by Dr. Norman Webb of the University of Wisconsin. See website: http://wvde.state.wv.us/oa/westest_index.html

The purpose of WESTEST 2 in the areas of mathematics and reading/language arts is to measure student mastery of the 21st century skills defined in the WV CSOs and thinking skills, including problem solving, creative thinking, and information and communications skills. The assessment results are used to re-direct instruction and assist in school improvement efforts in the area of science performance. WESTEST 2 was field tested in the fall of 2008 and became operational as the official state standardized test in the spring of 2009. The Federal Peer review process for WESTEST 2 is outlined and approved in the West Virginia Accountability Workbook which is posted on the federal website.

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.

The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) revised its student assessment program to measure a full range of knowledge and skills which incorporated multiple approaches to student assessments to improve record keeping on crucial learning outcomes of 21st century learning. The new assessments are aligned to the content, context, and learning tools of the 21st century, as defined by P21. The newly revised West Virginia Educational Standards Test (WESTEST 2), is a criterion-referenced test given in Grades 3-11 that measures student mastery of the 21st Century West Virginia Content Standards and Objectives (CSOs) by the content area and grade level in science. In 2007, WVDE awarded CTB/McGraw-Hill the bid, in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP), to develop the next iteration of the WESTEST, called WESTEST 2, which is aligned with the revised Science CSOs that include 21st century content, rigor, context, and learning skills. The alignment studies of these assessments to the new standards were completed by Dr. Norman Webb of the University of Wisconsin. See website: http://wvde.state.wv.us/oa/westest_index.html

The purpose of WESTEST 2 in the area of science is to measure student mastery of the 21st century skills defined in the WV CSOs and thinking skills, including problem solving, creative thinking, and information and communications skills. The assessment results are used to re-direct instruction and assist in school improvement efforts in the area of science performance. WESTEST 2 was field tested in the fall of 2008 and became operational as the official state standardized test in the spring of 2009. The Federal Peer review process for WESTEST 2 is outlined and approved in the West Virginia Accountability Workbook which is posted on the federal website.

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	141,530		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	168	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,039		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	7,779		>97%
Hispanic	1,356		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	131,177		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,858	21,116	96.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	764		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	74,070		>97%
Migratory students	19		>97%
Male	72,359		>97%
Female	69,171		>97%

Comments: We determined that we reported more grade levels than were supposed to be reported, since we should have been reporting ESEA grade levels. We are in the process of correcting the files and will enter the new values when the application is opened later. We will go ahead and submit the new files to EdFacts as soon as they are ready.

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(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	6,686	31.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,582	59.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,848	8.8
Total	21,116	
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	141,524		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	168	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,039		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	7,779		>97%
Hispanic	1,356		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	131,171		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,855	21,106	96.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	764		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	74,067		>97%
Migratory students	19		>97%
Male	72,356		>97%
Female	69,168		>97%
Comments: We determined that we reported more grade levels than were supposed to be reported, since we should have been reporting ESEA grade levels. We are in the process of correcting the files and will enter the new values when the application is opened later. We will go ahead and submit the new files to EdFacts as soon as they are ready.			

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	8,360	39.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10,902	51.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,844	8.7
Total	21,106	
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	141,524	135,918	96.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	174	165	94.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,039		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	7,779	7,470	96.0
Hispanic	1,356		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	131,171	125,950	96.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	21,855	19,793	90.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	764		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	74,067	70,472	95.2
Migratory students	19		>97%
Male	72,356	69,199	95.6
Female	69,168	66,719	96.5
Comments: For the children with severe disabilities only grade levels 4, 6, and 11 were tested in science.			

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	12,396	62.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	6,594	33.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	803	4.1
Total	19,793	
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

	# 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
Grade 3			
All students	20,440	13,416	65.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	31	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	155	132	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,165	631	54.2
Hispanic	208	127	61.1
White, non-Hispanic	18,873	12,495	66.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,878	1,819	46.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	141	89	63.1
Economically disadvantaged students	11,655	6,691	57.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,480	6,810	65.0
Female	9,960	6,606	66.3
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -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
Grade 3			
All students	20,437	13,229	64.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	39	22	56.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	155	134	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,165	651	55.9
Hispanic	209	117	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	18,869	12,305	65.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,874	1,412	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	142	82	57.8
Economically disadvantaged students	11,651	6,458	55.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,480	6,113	58.3
Female	9,957	7,116	71.5
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.3.1 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	19,995	11,174	55.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	25	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	155	113	72.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,144	456	39.9
Hispanic	204	101	49.5
White, non-Hispanic	18,455	10,479	56.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,600	1,457	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	142	70	49.3
Economically disadvantaged students	11,336	5,200	45.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,198	5,704	55.9
Female	9,797	5,470	55.8
Comments: WV administered a new assessment this year which was more rigorous than prior tests. Consequently, the percent of students determined proficient decreased dramatically. New rejectories will be established after the administration of this test for the second year.			

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	19,868	12,816	64.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	18	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	142	117	82.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,143	614	53.7
Hispanic	208	124	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	18,355	11,951	65.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,294	1,327	40.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	121	69	57.0
Economically disadvantaged students	11,042	6,122	55.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,051	6,436	64.0
Female	9,817	6,380	65.0
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.2.2 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	19,874	12,641	63.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	18	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	142	116	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,147	638	55.6
Hispanic	209	130	62.2
White, non-Hispanic	18,356	11,746	64.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,298	1,061	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	122	67	54.9
Economically disadvantaged students	11,046	6,028	54.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,052	5,628	56.0
Female	9,822	7,013	71.4
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.3.2 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	19,697	9,734	49.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	18	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	141	95	67.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,130	367	32.5
Hispanic	208	91	43.8
White, non-Hispanic	18,198	9,175	50.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,275	1,049	32.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	121	49	40.5
Economically disadvantaged students	10,927	4,390	40.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	9,967	5,201	52.2
Female	9,730	4,533	46.6
Comments: Correct as reported			

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	20,166	12,624	62.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	38	23	60.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	149	131	87.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,145	605	52.8
Hispanic	197	109	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	18,636	11,755	63.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,064	1,000	32.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	116	76	65.5
Economically disadvantaged students	11,013	5,818	52.8
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,282	6,452	62.8
Female	9,884	6,172	62.4
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.2.3 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	20,166	13,074	64.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	38	24	63.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	149	123	82.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,146	668	58.3
Hispanic	197	122	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	18,635	12,136	65.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,062	855	27.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	116	66	56.9
Economically disadvantaged students	11,010	6,118	55.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,280	5,901	57.4
Female	9,886	7,173	72.6
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

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	19,725	9,785	49.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	37	22	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	144	102	70.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,120	383	34.2
Hispanic	196	77	39.3
White, non-Hispanic	18,227	9,201	50.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,762	630	22.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	115	46	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	10,695	4,123	38.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,021	5,105	50.9
Female	9,704	4,680	48.2
Comments: Correct as reported			

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	19,937	11,871	59.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	151	131	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,095	515	47.0
Hispanic	202	106	52.5
White, non-Hispanic	18,472	11,109	60.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,807	728	25.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	119	65	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,666	5,351	50.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,260	6,025	58.7
Female	9,677	5,846	60.4
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

	# 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
Grade 6			
All students	19,927	12,892	64.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	11	68.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	152	124	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,093	624	57.1
Hispanic	201	124	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	18,464	12,009	65.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,805	656	23.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	120	70	58.3
Economically disadvantaged students	10,660	5,881	55.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,255	5,768	56.2
Female	9,672	7,124	73.7
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -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
Grade 6			
All students	19,725	11,408	57.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	16	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	152	127	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,089	443	40.7
Hispanic	201	109	54.2
White, non-Hispanic	18,266	10,721	58.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,766	796	28.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	119	67	56.3
Economically disadvantaged students	10,522	4,999	47.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,149	5,873	57.9
Female	9,576	5,535	57.8
Comments: Correct as reported			

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	20,045	11,106	55.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	17	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	149	125	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,067	411	38.5
Hispanic	182	88	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	18,629	10,476	56.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,872	598	20.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	104	51	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	10,528	4,646	44.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,287	5,705	55.5
Female	9,758	5,401	55.4
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.2.5 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	20,052	12,618	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	17	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	149	125	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,067	564	52.9
Hispanic	182	107	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	18,636	11,816	63.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,873	680	23.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	104	52	50.0
Economically disadvantaged students	10,535	5,552	52.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,294	5,519	53.6
Female	9,758	7,099	72.8
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

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	19,546	10,627	54.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	17	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	147	115	78.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,031	407	39.5
Hispanic	179	96	53.6
White, non-Hispanic	18,171	10,002	55.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,567	467	18.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	103	45	43.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,180	4,378	43.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	9,998	5,396	54.0
Female	9,548	5,231	54.8
Comments: Correct as reported			

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	20,582	10,999	53.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	13	61.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	109	77.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,153	433	37.6
Hispanic	190	96	50.5
White, non-Hispanic	19,078	10,348	54.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,876	604	21.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	91	37	40.7
Economically disadvantaged students	10,402	4,411	42.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,522	5,640	53.6
Female	10,060	5,359	53.3
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.2.6 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	20,550	12,522	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	14	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	139	113	81.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,153	590	51.2
Hispanic	190	105	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	19,047	11,700	61.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,869	591	20.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	90	43	47.8
Economically disadvantaged students	10,387	5,140	49.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,507	5,464	52.0
Female	10,043	7,058	70.3
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.3.6 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	20,025	11,102	55.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	14	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	140	100	71.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,125	455	40.4
Hispanic	189	100	52.9
White, non-Hispanic	18,550	10,433	56.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,556	549	21.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	90	34	37.8
Economically disadvantaged students	10,026	4,417	44.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	10,197	5,833	57.2
Female	9,828	5,269	53.6
Comments: Correct as reported			

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	17,544	10,322	58.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	19	10	52.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	137	109	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	859	391	45.5
Hispanic	141	72	51.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,388	9,740	59.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,325	555	23.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58	32	55.2
Economically disadvantaged students	6,944	3,338	48.1
Migratory students			
Male	8,829	5,009	56.7
Female	8,715	5,313	61.0
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.

1.3.2.7 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	17,545	9,141	52.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	19	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	137	99	72.3
Black, non-Hispanic	859	337	39.2
Hispanic	140	66	47.1
White, non-Hispanic	16,390	8,632	52.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,325	362	15.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58	24	41.4
Economically disadvantaged students	6,940	2,793	40.2
Migratory students			
Male	8,832	3,859	43.7
Female	8,713	5,282	60.6
Comments: Correct as reported			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

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	17,205	10,540	61.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	19	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	133	99	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	831	371	44.6
Hispanic	139	72	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	16,083	9,990	62.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,267	659	29.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58	29	50.0
Economically disadvantaged students	6,786	3,452	50.9
Migratory students			
Male	8,669	5,284	61.0
Female	8,536	5,256	61.6
Comments: Correct as reported			

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	762	612	80.3
Districts	55	3	5.4
Comments: correct as reported			

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	356	310	87.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	354	308	87.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	2	2	100.0
Comments: correct as reported			

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
55	3	5.4
Comments: correct as reported		

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	3
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	8
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 schools participated in state led training for professional learning communities and the schools were restructured in this manner.

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.

The technical assistance plan for district improvement is addressed at three levels.

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

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

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

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

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

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	19
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: Correct as reported.	

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	0	0
Schools	1	1
Comments: correct as reported		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	09/26/09
---	----------

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	6,805	6,383
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	3,880	4,727
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	57.0	74.1
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	6,803	6,280
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	4,024	4,938
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	59.2	78.6
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	8
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	4
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	15
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.
2	The strategies incorporated by the schools include the following reserch based practices: tiered instruction for reading/language arts, differentiated instruction, standards based instruction based on the revised CSOs, co teaching and utilizing a coaching model for embedded professional development, technology integration and also providing teacher collaborative time through a school organizational structure of professional learning communities.	23	4	4	D	

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

In order to assess the individual program effectiveness, the LEA and school administrative staff will be expected to assist the school improvement team in developing a high-quality professional development plan and to monitor classroom teachers to ensure the selected strategies are being implemented consistently and pervasively within all classrooms. The staff must annually evaluate the implementation of the school improvement program and measure the results in the improvement of student achievement. The evaluation must reflect a "balanced" assessment approach -a combination of formative and summative processes. The evaluation must demonstrate school progress towards achieving defined measurable goals and benchmarks and address how adjustments and improvements will be made as necessary to school improvement strategies. Changes in the school improvement plan should be made when data indicates technical assistance or a strategy or combination of strategies are not having the intended result. Moreover, accountability for the evaluation will be ensured by the annual evaluation report being submitted to the WVDE Title I coordinator for school improvement. Monitoring The SEA will monitor the effectiveness of the technical assistance provided by the LEA through its statewide system of three year cyclical monitoring and annual visits to Title I schools identified for improvement. One indicator on the LEA monitoring instrument requires districts to provide documentation of the type of assistance and the dates of technical assistance provided to identified Title I schools. Additionally, all district Title I directors are required to attend the SEA sponsored meetings for Title I schools identified for improvement as part of a school team. Each Title I school receives an on-site visit during the cyclical monitoring. The annual evaluation of the implementation of the school improvement program and measures of the results in improving academic achievement for all students will also be used for monitoring. Changes in the school improvement plan should be made when data indicates technical assistance or a strategy or combination of strategies are not having the intended result. Increases in other activities that lead to increased student achievement such as greater parental involvement and teacher collaboration will also be considered. Additional monitoring and accountability will be applied to the grants for the technology integration specialists. Accountability for this position is determined through the utilization of the following methods:

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

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

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.

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

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

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	10,707
Applied to transfer	95
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	94

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	\$ 131,501

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	3

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	4,241
Applied for supplemental educational services	184
Received supplemental educational services	184
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	\$ 159,779
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	103,435	95,449	92.3	7,986	7.7
All elementary classes	40,594	38,862	95.7	1,732	4.3
All secondary classes	62,841	56,587	90.0	6,254	10.0

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.

West Virginia counts each core academic taught at the elementary level for which the student receives a grade. For instance, elementary teachers who teach science, English, Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics to the same group of students would be counted four times.

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	49.1
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	34.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.3
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)	26.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	37.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	36.2
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	9,121	8,562	93.9
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	10,886	10,465	96.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	5,544	4,715	85.0
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	23,933	21,734	90.8

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	67.4	47.0
Poverty metric used	High Poverty Schools High poverty schools are in the top quartile of poverty in West Virginia when ranked from highest poverty level to the lowest level of poverty. Poverty is determined by the number of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Low Poverty Schools Low poverty schools are in the bottom quartile of poverty in West Virginia when ranked from highest poverty level to the lowest level of poverty. Poverty is determined by the number of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Neither High nor Low Poverty Schools classified as neither high nor low poverty are in the middle two quartile of schools in West Virginia when ranked from highest poverty level to the lowest level of poverty. Poverty is determined by the number of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	60.5	43.1
Poverty metric used	High Poverty Schools High poverty schools are in the top quartile of poverty in West Virginia when ranked from highest poverty level to the lowest level of poverty. Poverty is determined by the number of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Low Poverty Schools Low poverty schools are in the bottom quartile of poverty in West Virginia when ranked from highest poverty level to the lowest level of poverty. Poverty is determined by the number of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Neither High nor Low Poverty Schools classified as neither high nor low poverty are in the middle two quartile of schools in West Virginia when ranked from highest poverty level to the lowest level of poverty. Poverty is determined by the number of students receiving free or reduced lunch.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.*
- b. *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.*
- c. *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.*
- d. *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
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
No	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	1,770
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.	1,718
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	915
Chinese	173
Arabic	130
Undetermined	89
Vietnamese	75

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Uncoded Languages are students whose language falls outside West Virginia's defined list.

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	1,368
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	122
Total	1,490
Comments: 1368 is correct as reported.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	515
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	50.5
Comments: The file submitted carried the wrong total. It should have been 754 instead of 515.	

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	1,351
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	375
Total	1,726
Comments: This number is correct. It includes only the subgrant students instead of the total number tested.	
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.	102

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	221	36.5	1,143	80.10
ELP attainment	295	48.8	17	7.50
Comments: Numbers submitted incorrectly. Making progress should be 608 and ELP attainment should be 722.				

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
Comments: One year = 1257 Two Years = 458 Total = 1715		

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
479	417	87.1	62
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
480	416	86.7	64
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
Comments: # Tested = 468			
# At or above proficient =			
387 # Below proficient =			
81			

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	10
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	5
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	5
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	10
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	10
# -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)	0
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# -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:	

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:	

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
1,665	1,665	2

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

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: 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.	21
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

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	5	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	5	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	4	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	3	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	3	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	5	2,536
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	5	47
PD provided to principals	5	132
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	3	135
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	4	541
PD provided to community based organization personnel	3	85
Total	25	3,476

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
07/07/08	09/18/08	73
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.

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: There were not persistently dangerous schools reported for West Virginia, so zero (0) is correct.	

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	84.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	81.0
Hispanic	85.1
White, non-Hispanic	84.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	77.4
Limited English proficient	93.2
Economically disadvantaged	77.4
Migratory students	
Male	82.3
Female	85.6
Comments: There were no senior migrant students for this year.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3.2
Hispanic	2.3
White, non-Hispanic	3.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.3
Limited English proficient	1.8
Economically disadvantaged	3.8
Migratory students	0.0
Male	3.3
Female	2.7
Comments: West Virginia reported less than 100 migrant students for 2007-2008 and there were no dropouts.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	41	40
LEAs with subgrants	14	14
Total	55	54
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)		
K	175	191
1	206	194
2	158	172
3	139	183
4	129	195
5	139	182
6	109	205
7	124	193
8	165	238
9	141	212
10	169	176
11	101	121
12	128	112
Ungraded		
Total	1,883	2,374
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	226	216
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,328	1,313
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	54	21
Hotels/Motels	29	98
Total	1,637	1,648
Comments: Not all codes are represented in 1.9.1.2, not shown are Other, Unknown, Unaccompanied Youth, Substandard Housing, Awaiting Foster Care and Runaway -the totals represented here are the totals of the 4 codes stated above		

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)	97
K	191
1	190
2	169
3	178
4	192
5	179
6	193
7	187
8	233
9	208
10	166
11	121
12	110
Ungraded	
Total	2,414
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	69
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	469
Limited English proficient students	N<10
Comments: Unaccompanied youth = 146 Children with disabilities = 509 LEP = 11	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	14
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	10
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	6
Transportation	6
Early childhood programs	4
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	10
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	9
Counseling	9
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	13
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	10	N<10
4	12	N<10
5	11	N<10
6	13	N<10
7	11	N<10
8	11	N<10
High School	10	N<10
Comments: Corrected numbers are shown below 3=146 3=65 4=146 4=58 5=145 5=70 6=154 6=71 7=143 7=78 8=152 8=66 HS = 71 HS=28		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts 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	11	N<10
4	11	N<10
5	N<10	N<10
6	14	N<10
7	10	N<10
8	12	N<10
High School	N<10	N<10
<p>Comments: Correct data are shown below 3=146 3=66 4=147 4=57 5=145 5=64 6=155 6=58 7=144 7=58 8=151 8=59 HS=70 HS=30</p>		

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)	12
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	67
Comments: Counts are accurate as reported.	

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

Although there is a change of more than 10%, the actual number of students has only increased by 12 (55 to 67). The large percentage is due only to the small number of students identified in WV. This small but significant increase was due to the activity of our recruiter. However, our recruiter resigned in September, and we have not yet been able to find a replacement.

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)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	24
<p>Comments: West Virginia has struggled with efforts to identify migrant families. These numbers are a result of the active recruiting made possible by our recruiter who began work in June of 2008. However, this recruiter resigned as of September of 2009.</p>	

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

Although there is a change of more than 10%, the actual number of students has only increased by 3 (18 to 21). The large percentage is due only to the small number of students identified in WV.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

West Virginia has developed an electronic data base accessible by our recruiter to enter qualifying information and by our LEA's to enter information about services provided to the students. This data can be merged with student data in the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS) to obtain grade level and other essential data. This electronically stored data is submitted through files created to merge with EdFacts. All numbers have been entered automatically from the stored data in our electronic data base. This data has been checked for accuracy by review of the COE data entered by the recruiter against hard copies of the COE. This electronic data base did not exist for our 07-08 reporting. However, this improved method for reporting was not the reason for the difference in the numbers we are reporting. Rather, the difference is due to the fact we had no recruiter in place prior to June of 2008, and we did have a recruiter in place from June 2008 until September 2009.

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 recruiter enters COE data into an electronic data base accessible through the internet. This is not truly an electronic COE because the recruiter is filling out the normal paper COE and then will enter the data at her convenience when she has internet access. This data base is part of the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS) and was created specifically for the MEP data by programmers at WVDE. All data entered is verified by the Director of Migrant Education by comparing the electronic information with hard copies of the COE's. This COE data is accessible by the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS) for merging with school records and grade levels, etc. LEA Title I directors verify to the state Migrant Education Director that the WVEIS information is accurate and up to date prior to creating the files to submit to EdFacts for uploading to the CSPR. LEA level administrators can access the student records for the purpose of entering data in regards to services the migrant students have received.

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 collection process described above shows how the data is originally input by the migrant recruiter. The recruiter and the state director of Migrant Education are the only persons with access to all of the files in this data base. LEA Title I directors have access to data for the students in their LEA. If updates to the original COE data are needed, the recruiter or the director can make edits in the file. Information about services received and grade level are entered into the data base by the LEA Title I director and through merging information from the Migrant COE data with the general data kept in the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS).

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

same as above

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.

These counts are generated by querying the data base to find children in the proper age groups by using the date of birth entered in the COE data. Enrollment information is accessed from the WVEIS files. Children participating in summer school (or any MEP program) are identified by the LEA Title I directors in the section of the Migrant Education data base accessible to those persons. Queries are programmed to access counts for students matching the criteria for the various categories of 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.

Data collected in the same manner

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.

First, COE data is verified by the recruiter through a process of at least 2 interviews before it is entered into the data base. The state director of Migrant Education reviews the information entered online and checks it for accuracy with a hard copy of the COE. This is possible to do for all identified students because of the low number of identified students in West Virginia. Enrollment and grade level data are maintained in the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS) and are subject to the verifications for all data entered into that system. Information about services received through programs funded by Migrant Education grants is entered into the migrant student data base by the local LEA Title I director. The director certifies to the state director that the information is entered correctly.

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.

West Virginia is currently exempted from retrospective re-interviewing. The recruiter always interviews at least twice when first obtaining eligibility data for the COE.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state director verifies the information is entered correctly from the COE. Title I directors certify to the state director they have correctly entered the information pertaining to services received by students. Information about student services requires a response from the Title I director even if the student did not receive a service. In this way, we are assured every student record was accessed by the local LEA Title I director and information was entered for each student.

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.

A state WVEIS coordinator runs a report creating the files which will be sent to EdFacts. This information is given to the Migrant Education Director and the director checks to see if the numbers are being generated correctly. This is possible to check manually because of the small number of students identified in WV. This report is a reporting of the numbers generated by the queries developed to meet the EDfacts requirements for merging the data with the CSPR. Because this is the first year we have used this system (in fact, the data base was just created by WVDE programmers for WVEIS), we wanted to be sure the algorithm was picking up the correct counts for the various categories. Because of the small number of students identified in WV, it was possible to look through the numbers of students registered in the data base in each of the categories reported and verify their accuracy. The records in the data base had previously been verified by comparing the entries with the paper COE's.

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.

Currently West Virginia is without a recruiter. The recruiter who had been hired in June of 2008 resigned as of September of 2009. Prior to that resignation, any information needing to be changed based on new information received through re-interviewing, was simply adjusted by editing the online data. The situation is unclear as to what will happen for the 2009-2010 school year as efforts to hire a replacement have been unsuccessful.

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.

West Virginia believes the child counts to be very accurate. Due to the small number of identified students, individual student data is easily verified on a case by case basis. Our biggest concern is having not identified all eligible students in the state. Between June of 2008 and September of 2009 West Virginia was served by 1 migrant recruiter on a part-time basis. It has not been possible for this person to ensure all eligible students have been identified across the entire state. It is also not possible to increase our recruiting staff with a total MEP grant of under \$80,000. This situation is likely to be exaggerated for the 2009-2010 school year because West Virginia's recruiter has resigned as of September of 2009 and efforts to hire a new recruiter have been unsuccessful.