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 2009-10

VIRGINIA

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

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) 2009-10 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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-HLP-EDEN (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:
_X_Part I, 2009-10 ___Part II, 2009-10

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

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

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Ms. Veronica Tate, Director of Program Administration and Accountability

Telephone: (804) 225-2870

Fax: (804) 371-7347

e-mail: Veronica.Tate@doe.virginia.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of Public Instruction

_____ _____Wednesday, March 16, 2011, 10:09:19 AM
Signature

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2009-10

PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) were originally developed and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in June 1995. Following the schedule established by the Board for revision of all content standards, the revised mathematics standards of learning were approved by the Board on October 22, 2009, and are scheduled to be implemented in 2011-2012. The revised science standards and the English/reading standards of learning were approved by the Board January 14, 2010, and are scheduled to be implemented in 2012-2013.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111 (b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia's new mathematics assessments measuring revised content standards adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2009 will be implemented in 2011-2012. The new assessments will include alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards as well as alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. New cut scores for these tests will also be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2012.

Virginia's new reading assessments measuring revised content standards adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2010 will be implemented in 2012-2013. The new assessments will include alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards as well as alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards. New cut scores for these tests will also be adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in 2013.

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

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	30.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	70.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments:	

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 Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	777,019		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,467		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	47,008		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	204,367		>97
Hispanic	70,840		>97
White, non-Hispanic	452,337		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	93,714		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	51,692		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	274,971		>97
Migratory students	223		>97
Male	393,937		>97
Female	383,082		>97
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	33,428	35.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	35,697	38.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	16,987	18.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,014	7.5
Total	93,126	
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	641,085		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,035		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	38,497		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	167,942		>97
Hispanic	56,997		>97
White, non-Hispanic	375,614		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	81,896		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	42,430		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	231,991		>97
Migratory students	168		>97
Male	326,955		>97
Female	314,130		>97
Comments:			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	37,275	45.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	19,306	23.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	17,945	22.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,996	8.6
Total	81,522	
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	519,031		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,705		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	31,206		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	135,237		>97
Hispanic	45,932	43,933	95.6
White, non-Hispanic	304,951		>97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	59,301		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,103	28,313	91.0
Economically disadvantaged students	175,928		>97
Migratory students	135	124	91.9
Male	261,444		>97
Female	257,587		>97
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,992	44.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,370	45.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,828	3.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,997	6.9
Total	58,187	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,879	84,921	91.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	254	95.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,876	5,661	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,924	20,455	85.5
Hispanic	9,379	8,107	86.4
White, non-Hispanic	53,434	50,444	94.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,241	9,567	78.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,043	7,656	84.7
Economically disadvantaged students	37,255	32,056	86.0
Migratory students	37	31	83.8
Male	47,360	43,041	90.9
Female	45,519	41,880	92.0
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,591	76,969	83.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	272	234	86.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,758	5,244	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,890	17,143	71.8
Hispanic	9,241	7,282	78.8
White, non-Hispanic	53,430	47,066	88.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,238	8,291	67.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,651	6,737	77.9
Economically disadvantaged students	36,991	27,393	74.1
Migratory students	34	28	82.4
Male	47,230	38,429	81.4
Female	45,361	38,540	85.0
Comments:			

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	90,170	81,821	90.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	251	94.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,365	5,132	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,682	19,555	82.6
Hispanic	7,698	6,540	85.0
White, non-Hispanic	53,160	50,343	94.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,775	9,011	76.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,353	5,207	82.0
Economically disadvantaged students	35,254	29,566	83.9
Migratory students	28	22	78.6
Male	45,929	41,622	90.6
Female	44,241	40,199	90.9
Comments:			

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	93,296	82,164	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	256	219	85.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,830	5,507	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	24,401	19,649	80.5
Hispanic	8,947	7,238	80.9
White, non-Hispanic	53,862	49,551	92.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,680	9,555	75.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,994	6,184	77.4
Economically disadvantaged students	37,174	30,035	80.8
Migratory students	33	24	72.7
Male	47,792	42,124	88.1
Female	45,504	40,040	88.0
Comments:			

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	93,031	81,930	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	257	231	89.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,694	5,366	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	24,317	19,378	79.7
Hispanic	8,833	7,485	84.7
White, non-Hispanic	53,930	49,470	91.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,655	9,582	75.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,610	6,241	82.0
Economically disadvantaged students	36,907	29,642	80.3
Migratory students	32	24	75.0
Male	47,643	41,219	86.5
Female	45,388	40,711	89.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	86,733	77,960	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	277	248	89.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,536	4,282	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,499	19,861	84.5
Hispanic	8,219	6,985	85.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,202	46,584	92.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,881	9,114	76.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,795	5,418	79.7
Economically disadvantaged students	34,996	29,394	84.0
Migratory students	29	20	69.0
Male	44,240	39,461	89.2
Female	42,493	38,499	90.6
Comments:			

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	91,142	82,400	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	288	261	90.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,316	5,074	95.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,885	19,996	83.7
Hispanic	8,337	7,215	86.5
White, non-Hispanic	53,316	49,854	93.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,008	9,365	78.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,622	5,530	83.5
Economically disadvantaged students	35,184	29,509	83.9
Migratory students	25	19	76.0
Male	46,629	41,441	88.9
Female	44,513	40,959	92.0
Comments:			

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	91,409	80,123	87.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	289	261	90.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,433	4,986	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23,893	18,935	79.2
Hispanic	8,446	6,485	76.8
White, non-Hispanic	53,348	49,456	92.7
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,969	8,234	68.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,945	4,645	66.9
Economically disadvantaged students	35,435	27,719	78.2
Migratory students	27	17	63.0
Male	46,762	41,383	88.5
Female	44,647	38,740	86.8
Comments:			

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	82,612	63,132	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	274	203	74.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,522	3,999	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22,789	14,708	64.5
Hispanic	7,826	5,356	68.4
White, non-Hispanic	47,201	38,866	82.3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,344	6,955	61.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,226	3,879	62.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,664	21,086	64.6
Migratory students	20	12	60.0
Male	42,318	31,962	75.5
Female	40,294	31,170	77.4
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	90,902	80,033	88.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	303	274	90.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,447	5,164	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	24,159	19,251	79.7
Hispanic	8,011	6,600	82.4
White, non-Hispanic	52,982	48,744	92.0
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,513	8,282	71.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,146	4,782	77.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,839	26,887	79.5
Migratory students	21	17	81.0
Male	46,670	40,172	86.1
Female	44,232	39,861	90.1
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

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	60,009	44,454	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	145	74.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,984	2,558	85.7
Black, non-Hispanic	15,653	9,788	62.5
Hispanic	6,322	4,046	64.0
White, non-Hispanic	34,856	27,917	80.1
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,959	6,716	67.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,170	3,107	60.1
Economically disadvantaged students	24,433	15,426	63.1
Migratory students	17	13	76.5
Male	31,115	22,576	72.6
Female	28,894	21,878	75.7
Comments:			

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	89,635	79,567	88.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	293	259	88.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,328	5,030	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	23,200	18,567	80.0
Hispanic	7,996	6,639	83.0
White, non-Hispanic	52,818	49,072	92.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,291	8,127	72.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,636	4,278	75.9
Economically disadvantaged students	32,093	25,560	79.6
Migratory students	21	16	76.2
Male	45,844	39,856	86.9
Female	43,791	39,711	90.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

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

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	82,745	71,867	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	287	249	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,791	4,540	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	23,174	18,318	79.0
Hispanic	7,424	6,003	80.9
White, non-Hispanic	47,069	42,757	90.8
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,930	8,649	72.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,959	3,673	74.1
Economically disadvantaged students	30,762	24,116	78.4
Migratory students	22	16	72.7
Male	42,747	36,387	85.1
Female	39,998	35,480	88.7
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	91,299	81,889	89.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	318	294	92.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,436	5,172	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	23,626	19,506	82.6
Hispanic	7,808	6,625	84.8
White, non-Hispanic	54,111	50,292	92.9
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,932	8,454	70.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,795	3,702	77.2
Economically disadvantaged students	31,579	25,744	81.5
Migratory students	18	15	83.3
Male	46,592	40,843	87.7
Female	44,707	41,046	91.8
Comments:			

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	88,824	81,301	91.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	299	93.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,412	5,101	94.3
Black, non-Hispanic	22,765	19,368	85.1
Hispanic	7,839	6,436	82.1
White, non-Hispanic	52,487	50,097	95.4
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,206	7,999	71.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,060	3,458	68.3
Economically disadvantaged students	30,934	25,825	83.5
Migratory students	18	15	83.3
Male	45,165	41,246	91.3
Female	43,659	40,055	91.7
Comments:			

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	275,116	251,086	91.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	899	834	92.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,333	17,627	96.1
Black, non-Hispanic	69,693	58,894	84.5
Hispanic	22,270	19,383	87.0
White, non-Hispanic	163,921	154,348	94.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	23,091	17,954	77.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,266	9,490	84.2
Economically disadvantaged students	76,032	65,047	85.6
Migratory students	64	57	89.1
Male	136,223	123,839	90.9
Female	138,893	127,247	91.6
Comments:			

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	91,155	85,690	94.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	299	288	96.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,479	5,267	96.1
Black, non-Hispanic	24,311	21,595	88.8
Hispanic	6,645	5,969	89.8
White, non-Hispanic	54,421	52,571	96.6
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	9,885	7,546	76.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,893	2,312	79.9
Economically disadvantaged students	24,671	21,729	88.1
Migratory students	17	15	88.2
Male	45,490	42,537	93.5
Female	45,665	43,153	94.5
Comments:			

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	243,373	218,384	89.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	815	752	92.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,448	13,566	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	63,550	51,170	80.5
Hispanic	19,950	16,265	81.5
White, non-Hispanic	144,610	136,631	94.5
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	23,237	15,978	68.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,955	6,977	70.1
Economically disadvantaged students	70,818	56,890	80.3
Migratory students	51	37	72.5
Male	120,695	108,976	90.3
Female	122,678	109,408	89.2
Comments:			

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,859	1,134	61.0
Districts	132	12	9.1
Comments:			

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 2009-10 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 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	725	472	65.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	397	248	62.5
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	328	224	68.3
Comments:			

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
132	12	9.1
Comments:		

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer).

[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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	1
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	3
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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	1
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	3
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	5
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The activities conducted by schools in their second year of restructuring under "other major restructuring of the school governance," are listed below.

• Received bi-weekly or monthly assistance from alternative governance committees.
• Received the assistance of on-site administrative and/or core academic coaches.*
• Focused targeted attention on central office/division-level assistance to schools in restructuring through the Center on Innovation and Improvement's online school improvement planning tool. Information can be found at the following Web site: http://www.centerii.org/aboutus/.
• Received technical assistance for administrators and teachers from the Virginia Department of Education upon request.
• Appointed a new school administration.
• Revised/aligned the division/school curriculum pacing guides and conducted trainings.
• Increased classroom monitoring strategies.
• Implemented school reform strategies proven successful in Virginia's Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) initiative. Information about the PASS initiative can be found at the following Web site: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/resources/pass/index.shtml

*Emphasis has been placed on the selection of outside experts with expertise in core subject areas, especially reading and mathematics, and school reform or school leadership experience. Certain schools in Year 2 of restructuring receive academic coaches in addition to the alternative governance experts on the committees as a result of blended restructuring requirements under the Standards of Accreditation and alternative governance restructuring requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- 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).

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia had no divisions identified as in improvement or corrective action. The Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook amended May 2009 states:
Virginia will identify divisions for improvement only when they do not make AYP in the "same subject area or both other academic indicators" and all grade spans for two consecutive years. (p.27) This identification process resulted in no divisions being identified as in improvement for 2010-2011.

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 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	21	12
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	10/06/10

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 2009-10.
Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 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 2010.
  - 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 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
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 2009-10	23,857	23,604
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 2009-10	19,650	18,389
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 2009-10	82.4	77.9
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 2009-10	23,251	22,993
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 2009-10	18,770	18,497
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 2009-10	80.7	80.4
Comments:		

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that **made adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10	34
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **exited improvement status** based on testing in SY 2009-10	15

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10
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 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

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 (strategies) was(were) used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance**	**Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), 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 (strategies)** (See response options in *"Column 6 Response Options Box"* below)	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"** This response is limited to 500 characters.
5	Improve teaching and learning by the hiring of coaches to : 1) provide professional development through workshops on literacy and mathematics instruction , planning and assessment; (2) collaboratively plan lessons with selected teachers; 3) interpret diagnostic assessments ; 4) collect data to evaluate programs for instructional decision-making and monitoring of student progress; and 5) provide learning opportunities for parents through meetings and workshops.	7	2	1	A	
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1 and 5 comprise this combination.	41	8	8	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 4 and 5 comprise this combination.	7	1	2	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 1, 4, and 5 comprise this combination.	19	3	6	A	
Comments:						

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

improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells B = Increased teacher retention C = Improved parental involvement D = Other

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has taken a comprehensive approach to providing school divisions with an opportunity to share effective strategies they have implemented using 1003(g) funds. During the 2009-2010 school year, school divisions participated in the following professional development opportunities: (1) a series of on-site training sessions throughout the school year emphasizing data analysis and revising school improvement plans to address areas of need; (2) monthly webinars focusing on the status of school improvement plan implementation; and (3) a week-long summer institute providing information for coaches and school division personnel regarding implementation of the state's coaching model. An opportunity for school divisions to share effective strategies was a component of each professional development opportunity described above.

Through a partnership with the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII), the VDOE has created a video archive of effective instructional strategies through the Indicators in Action component of the Indistar™ Web-based planning tool. This component features video clips of teachers, principals, and teacher teams implementing indicators of effective instruction.

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 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:

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

For SY 2009-10 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 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The technical assistance related to implementation of the 1003(g) grants was provided through webinars and on-site professional development opportunities. The focus of the webinars was based on the information the grantees entered into the Indistar™ Web-based planning tool developed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII). The tool requires grantees to develop a Web-based school improvement plan and provide monthly updates regarding the school's implementation of the plan. VDOE staff and trained VFEL consultants review the information submitted by the schools and conduct monthly webinars to discuss progress and provide technical assistance. Finally, all grantees participated in a week-long summer professional development institute that provided training for coaches and school division personnel regarding implementation of the state's coaching model. The training was developed and implemented through the CII, VFEL, and ARCC of Edvantia partnership.

The Office of School Improvement (OSI) collaborated with the ARCC at Edvantia to conduct an evaluation through focus groups and online surveys to gauge the effectiveness of technical assistance activities provided to school and central office personnel. In June 2010, focus groups and online surveys were used to collect information from division representatives, teachers, and principals who participated in Section 1003(g) activities including the summer professional development institute, monthly webinars, and on-site training. The questions focused on how the technical assistance activities impacted school improvement efforts. Evaluation results will be used to improve future training.

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 2009-10 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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	52,842
Applied to transfer	1,563
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,112
Comments:	

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	$ 2,391,684

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	7

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.

Comments:

[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	23,351
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,948
Received supplemental educational services	5,535
Comments:	

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	$ 7,432,254
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.

	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	213,395	211,055	98.9	2,340	1.1
All elementary classes	51,327	50,832	99.0	495	1.0
All secondary classes	162,068	160,223	98.9	1,845	1.1

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	70.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	14.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	16.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	68.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	17.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	15.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	12,438	12,231	98.3
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	14,292	14,199	99.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	23,627	23,004	97.4
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	56,016	55,694	99.4
1.5.3.1 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.			

1.5.3.1 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	63.3	24.8
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	53.7	23.3
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentages of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other types of programs include: elementary and secondary newcomer programs; virtual ESL classes; after school tutoring; push-in; support for parents; inclusion; and collaboration.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	97,763
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.	97,505
Comments:	

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	59,735
Arabic	4,367
Korean	3,871
Vietnamese	3,741
Urdu	2,953

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	97,763
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	97,763
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17,221
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.6
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	97,505
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	97,505
Comments:	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. 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 students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	33,040

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number and percent 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 and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of 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	41,148	63.8		64.00
Attained proficiency	17,183	17.6		15.00
Comments: Of the 97,505 LEP students tested in the 2009-2010 administration of the ELP assessment, a total of 88,554 usable test records were included in the state-calculated results of 75 percent for AMAO 1 (progress) and 19 percent for AMAO 2 (proficiency). The results displayed in 1.6.3.2.2 differ from the state-calculated results because the auto-calculation formula for the table above uses the total number of LEP students tested (97,505) as the denominator. Virginia Department of Education assessment staff have provided detailed technical assistance to school divisions to maximize the number of usable records submitted for LEP students participating in future administrations of the ELP assessment. The state anticipates that the number of usable test records included in the 2010-2011 calculations for AMAO 1 (progress) and AMAO 2 (proficiency) will more closely match the total number of LEP students tested in 2010-2011.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	_____No
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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.
- 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
10,724	7,197	17,921
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
15,439	14,163	91.7	1,276
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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
12,614	11,733	93.0	881
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 out of language instruction educational programs 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.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
10,010	9,225	92.2	785
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	112
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	14
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	51
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	36
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	28
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	10
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	10
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	1

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Virginia includes consortia members as an entity in the total number of subgrantees in table 1.6.4.1

Of the sixty-three subgrantees, fourteen subgrantees met all three Title III AMAOs and twelve subgrantees were too small in one or more AMAOs.

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 all three Title III AMAOs	Yes
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?	N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
26,106	17,452	22

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.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,862
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	700

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	58	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	51	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	50	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	46	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	36	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	56	11,976
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	57	3,509
PD provided to principals	64	1,616
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	45	2,155
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	45	2,155
PD provided to community based organization personnel	28	1,221
Total		22,632

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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/28/10	9/11/10	45
Comments:		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	

Comments: Virginia has no persistently dangerous schools.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	73.2
Hispanic	70.8
White, non-Hispanic	85.2
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	47.5
Limited English proficient	64.9
Economically disadvantaged	71.0
Migratory students	55.8
Male	77.8
Female	85.0
Comments:	

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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	<3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	<3
Hispanic	3.4
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	<3
Limited English proficient	3.3
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	3.4
Male	<3
Female	<3
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	**#LEAs Reporting Data**
LEAs without subgrants	87	87
LEAs with subgrants	45	45
Total	132	132
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	54	426
K	187	1,326
1	179	1,208
2	164	1,109
3	200	1,050
4	145	967
5	156	1,002
6	136	889
7	117	779
8	121	767
9	147	964
10	112	647
11	60	539
12	139	633
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total		
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	255	2,190
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,360	8,430
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	59	308
Hotels/Motels	243	1,378
Total	1,917	12,306
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	500
K	1,096
1	1,074
2	985
3	1,054
4	974
5	972
6	858
7	786
8	802
9	956
10	652
11	563
12	668
Ungraded	
Total	11,940
Comments:	

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	862
Migratory children/youth	214
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,101
Limited English proficient students	1,491
Comments:	

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	32
Expedited evaluations	15
Staff professional development and awareness	32
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	29
Transportation	39
Early childhood programs	21
Assistance with participation in school programs	27
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	25
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	24
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	31
Coordination between schools and agencies	32
Counseling	20
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	24
Clothing to meet a school requirement	26
School supplies	39
Referral to other programs and services	28
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	26
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One subgrantee reported mentoring and one subgrantee reported arranging emergency financial support through alternate donations.

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	4
School Selection	5
Transportation	14
School records	7
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One subgrantee reported parental cooperation.

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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	908	597
4	861	649
5	875	657
6	751	553
7	656	458
8	672	503
High School	495	414
Comments:		

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/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	926	714
4	861	630
5	878	657
6	740	394
7	534	258
8	691	481
High School	1,440	1,141
Comments:		

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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:

a. 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.

b. 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	108
K	83
1	73
2	82
3	71
4	68
5	56
6	39
7	33
8	31
9	47
10	32
11	23
12	22
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	186
Total	954
Comments: Virginia has no migrant students under the classification of ungraded.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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)	75
K	49
1	58
2	50
3	61
4	47
5	37
6	29
7	27
8	18
9	25
10	25
11	16
12	11
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	97
Total	625
Comments: Virginia has no migrant students under the classification of ungraded.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia used the new state Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system to generate the 2009-2010 category 1 and 2 child count. The database consists of core and additional data that represent the elements within the national Certificate of Eligibility (COE) used by recruiters and migrant coordinators around the state.
Virginia used the MIS 2000 database system to generate the 2008-2009 category 1 and category 2 child count.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The migratory child count data are collected year round from September 1, 2009, through August 31, 2010.

The data collected are found on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is divided into five sections: 1) parent data; 2) child data; 3) eligibility data; 4) verification; and 5) state specific data. The parent data include parent or guardian names as well as current and home addresses. The child data include name, birth date, type of documentation used to confirm birth date, gender, grade enrollment date, and service location. Virginia began using the national COE in the spring of 2009. Additional state required data were added to the national COE, including: race/ethnicity, immunization records, qualification for other services, such as English as a second language (ESL) and special education, enrollment type, location, and home base school. The eligibility data for the 2009-2010 school year include the qualifying arrival date (QAD), the last qualifying move (LQM), qualifying activity, the category of the move (with, to join, or on own), and the residency date.

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

The activities used to collect data were: personal interviews, a review of school records, school record requests from previous schools, discussion and communication with previous and current school personnel, and/or telephone updates. The data were collected by recruiters and/or migrant coordinators. When migratory families are identified, COE forms are completed during an interview conducted by the recruiter. The recruiter submits the completed COE to the migrant coordinator who reviews the COE for accuracy and verifies the information within five business days. After verification, all COE forms are entered into the state Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system.

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

At the end of each semester/term or when a migrant child leaves, the program teacher/recruiter completes a withdrawal form. The withdrawal form collects demographic data on the student as well as program services. The withdrawal form was updated to collect additional data. Additional elements added include: 1) ESL services and limited English proficiency (ELP) level; 2) referred services; and 3) achievement of GED. The teacher/recruiter indicates if and what type of instructional support or referred services the student received. Other data collected includes ELP level and assessment data. The withdrawal form is submitted to the migrant coordinator who reviews it for accuracy before being entered into the MSDC system. If the student remains in the migrant program and is eligible to receive services the next semester or school year, an update is made to the COE at the start of the new semester. An interview with the family is conducted to check accuracy of the data on the original COE. Changes, if any, on the new COE are entered into the MSDC system. If the student is not enrolled or available for revalidation, the student is removed from the current list of eligible students. A new COE is only created when a student has made a qualifying move. As part of the recertification process, the Virginia Migrant Education Program participates in prospective re-interviewing of families annually to ensure accurate eligibility and student information and local educational agencies are provided students lists that are checked monthly and at the end-of-project to ensure student records are updated in the state migrant student database system.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data are entered by the local migrant coordinators or designee for each Migrant Education Program (MEP) around the state. The migrant coordinator is responsible for inputting and updating all data, to include the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and Withdrawal Form.

The local migrant coordinators communicate with the local MEP staff regarding COE information submitted to ensure accuracy of new and existing student records. Student records are updated through withdrawal forms as well as changes to key data fields within the child data of the COE. A separate withdrawal form is submitted upon a student's departure.

The local coordinators and recruiters evaluate the accuracy and efficiency of the forms used to collect the data. Throughout the year, each MEP coordinator trains program staff as needed. Reports from the local migrant coordinators regarding identification certification, participation, and withdrawal are reviewed throughout the school year. The local migrant coordinators review program eligibility prior to entering student information into the Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system. If the local migrant coordinator has concerns about eligibility, the state migrant director is consulted and a final review is conducted.

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

procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count is calculated through the Virginia Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system. The MSDC system consists of core and additional data that are representative of the elements within the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) used by the local migrant coordinators and recruiters around the state. The key data elements used to ensure accurate category 1 and category 2 child counts consist of the enrollment, withdrawal, residency, qualifying activity, and qualifying arrival date (QAD) dates, as well as school history data that establish a child's presence during the year. The COE was revised in the spring of 2008 to collect accurate data that is required by the Migrant Student Information Exchange System (MSIX), in the spring of 2009 with the national COE, and then again in the spring of 2010 to include birth country and race/ethnicity codes. The database also assigns students unique identification numbers in the MSDC. In addition, the Virginia State Testing Identifier (STI) is collected on the COE. Virginia included the STI to allow linking of migrant student records to the Virginia Student Information System.

To maintain accurate counts of eligible students, the database recognizes migrant students who are between the ages of three and twenty-one as well as those who were previously enrolled. The MSDC system automatically calculates student's three-year eligibility based on the birth date and QAD to ensure students whose eligibility has expired is not included in the child count. The following additional data fields are used to avoid duplication: parent data, mother's maiden name, child's birthplace, birth date, age, home base, and student identification number.

During the summer/intersession terms, local migrant coordinators are required to verify weekly attendance records to ensure accurate counts for students participating in a summer program. Teachers, tutors, and/or migrant student advocates record attendance and/or services provided, and send the attendance/service reports to the local migrant coordinators who review for verification prior to being entered into the MSDC system. The Student Enrollment report may be generated from the MSDC system when verifying the number of participants in the regular and summer/intersession terms when determining the Category 1 and Category 2 child count. Once student enrollment numbers have been verified in the MSDC system, the local migrant coordinator selects the 'Submit to the DOE' button within the MSDC system, which closes the data collection window for the reporting period.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Local recruiters initially review program eligibility via the COE and then forward the data to the migrant coordinator who conducts a final review of eligibility. If the local migrant coordinator has concerns, the state migrant director conducts a final review.

The COEs from each MEP are crosschecked for accuracy against the data elements in the state Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system prior to being compiled into a state report. If questions arise concerning the data within the report, the local migrant coordinator verifies that the data are correct. All local MEP data are confirmed with the state migrant director at the Virginia Department of Education for final review and approval if needed or requested.

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

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

In addition, for the 2009-2010 school year, the Virginia Department of Education provided training on the COE, the MSDC system, and the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system in collaboration with the Office of Migrant Education.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia conducted prospective re-interviewing during the 2009-2010 school year. Following section 200.89(b)(2) found in the Code of Federal Regulations effective August 28, 2008, Virginia sampled 50 COEs from the current year's eligibility pool. The COEs were randomly sampled from migrant education programs that had not previously been through a re-interview process. Recruiters not involved in the initial determination of eligibility were responsible for conducting the re-interviewing. Re-interviewing was conducted via face to face and/or by phone during the spring and summer of 2010.

75 migrant families were randomly selected to go through the re-interview process. 61 families were re-interviewed. From the 61 re-interviews, all families were found to be eligible for the Migrant Education Program. The 14 families unavailable for re-interviews had moved prior to this process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Virginia Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff members take several steps to check that child count data are entered and updated accurately. Local migrant coordinators are required to monitor the student information entered into the Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system to ensure accurate records at both state and local levels. In addition, coordinators may generate MSDC student enrollment reports throughout the year and have been trained on using the national Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system, and can conduct data checks using the MSIX log-in.

Throughout the year, the local migrant recruiters submit updated COEs to the migrant coordinators that reflect changes and/or revisions to student information within the COE. The state director also monitors and tracks the flow of data from the local MEP to the MSDC system as needed through the monitoring of random COE reviews. The state director communicates and meets with the local migrant coordinators to discuss programmatic issues and the status of child counts.

Virginia conducts Title I, Part C, Federal Program Monitoring for divisional and regional MEP on a five year cycle. As part of the monitoring process, Virginia monitors the following six categories: 1) Identification and Recruitment; 2) State and Student Assessment; 3) Program Services and Provision of Services; 4) Parent and Community Involvement; 5) Fiduciary; and 6) Record keeping. For the purposes of

verifying child count data, if the monitoring indicates that records are not being checked and cross-checked in the areas of Identification and Recruitment; Program Services and Provision of Services; and Record keeping, corrective actions are taken.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, state staff review reports to ensure accuracy of eligible students present during the current reporting period. The local migrant coordinators generate student enrollment reports that show participants in the regular and summer/intersession terms when determining the Category 1 and Category 2 child count. The MEP coordinators review the reports before data are entered into the Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system and submitted to the state director. If discrepancies are found, the local migrant coordinators communicate with MEP staff to determine whether a correction is necessary. If clarification is needed, the state migrant director works with the Office of Migrant Education to determine eligibility. At the state level, migrant data from the MSDC system is cross-checked against the data from the state student information system to ensure accuracy. The same data elements are collected from the local migrant coordinators as the U.S. Department of Education collects from states in the annual Consolidated State Performance Report.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To improve eligibility determinations, the state provided a series of webinars, teleconferences, and meetings on completing the COE, clarifying key definitions such as temporary and continuation of services provision, the use of the Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) and the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) systems during the 2009-2010 school year. All local migrant coordinators and data entry personnel were invited to attend. For coordinators and data entry personnel not able to attend training materials were provided and follow up was conducted by the state director.

During the fall of 2010, the revised Title I, Part C, Education of Migratory Children Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance (October 23, 2003), Chapter II: Child Eligibility was disseminated to local migrant coordinators and recruiters. In addition, the document was posted on the Virginia Migrant Education Program Web site and included in a Superintendent's Informational Memorandum released in September 2010 on the Identification of Migratory Children

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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