CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*), as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
__X__Part I, 2011-12 ___Part II, 2011-12

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

_____ Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 8:46:15 AM
Signature

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2011-12

PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2009-10	2010-11	2010-11

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
_____State has revised or changed	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-12	2012-2013	2012-2013
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-12	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2011-12	2012-2013	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-12	2012-2013	2012-2013

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.*

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
Regular Assessments in High School	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	2012-2013	2012-2013
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2011-2012	2012-2013	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2011-2012	2012-2013	2012-2013

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

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 2011-12, 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)	57.00
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	43.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 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)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	S	781,161	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,506	>=99
Asian	S	47,833	>=99
Black or African American	S	184,947	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	89,927	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,157	>=99
White	S	421,661	>=99
Two or more races	S	33,130	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	96,255	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	47,465	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	296,082	>=99
Migratory students	S	172	>=98
Male	S	397,262	>=99
Female	S	383,899	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	35,689	37.08
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	47,872	49.73
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	4,985	5.18
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,709	8.01
Total	96,255	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	S	650,270	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,075	>=99
Asian	S	39,528	>=99
Black or African American	S	153,742	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	73,374	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	915	>=99
White	S	352,491	>=99
Two or more races	S	28,145	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	83,100	>=99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	36,996	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	249,555	>=99
Migratory students	S	153	>=98
Male	S	332,179	>=99
Female	S	318,091	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	0

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.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	46,078	55.45
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	23,032	27.72
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	6,432	7.74
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,558	9.10
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	0.00
Total	83,100	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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	S	513,071	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,645	>=99
Asian	S	31,220	98
Black or African American	S	119,723	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	54,972	95
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	789	>=99
White	S	283,021	>=99
Two or more races	S	21,701	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	58,003	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	25,891	88
Economically disadvantaged students	S	182,740	98
Migratory students	S	101	94
Male	S	258,857	>=99
Female	S	254,214	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	24,886	42.90
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,166	48.56
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	554	0.96
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,397	7.58
Total	58,003	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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	93,144	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	280	S	57
Asian	6,221	S	81
Black or African American	21,172	S	46
Hispanic or Latino	11,787	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	146	S	69
White	49,092	S	71
Two or more races	4,446	S	66
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,104	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,658	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	38,603	S	47
Migratory students	24	S	50
Male	47,428	S	64
Female	45,716	S	63
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2011-2012 school year, Virginia administered new mathematics assessments which affected the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient.			

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	92,861	S	86
American Indian or Alaska Native	279	S	84
Asian	6,101	S	92
Black or African American	21,199	S	76
Hispanic or Latino	11,637	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	146	S	90
White	49,057	S	90
Two or more races	4,442	S	88
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,074	S	67
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,242	S	73
Economically disadvantaged students	38,398	S	77
Migratory students	24	S	75
Male	47,298	S	83
Female	45,563	S	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	89,594	S	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	271	S	91
Asian	5,600	S	96
Black or African American	20,944	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	9,472	S	87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	141	S	92
White	48,752	S	94
Two or more races	4,414	S	92
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,432	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,082	S	83
Economically disadvantaged students	35,899	S	82
Migratory students	18	S	83
Male	45,536	S	89
Female	44,058	S	90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	93,125	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	286	S	66
Asian	5,995	S	86
Black or African American	21,643	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	11,630	S	61
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	122	S	72
White	49,140	S	77
Two or more races	4,309	S	73
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,683	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,983	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	38,700	S	55
Migratory students	33	S	39
Male	47,764	S	70
Female	45,361	S	69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2011-2012 school year, Virginia administered new mathematics assessments which affected the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient.			

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	92,945	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	S	88
Asian	5,880	S	94
Black or African American	21,655	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	11,517	S	83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	125	S	91
White	49,180	S	92
Two or more races	4,306	S	91
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,684	S	69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,609	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	38,544	S	80
Migratory students	31	S	58
Male	47,672	S	86
Female	45,273	S	90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 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	88,135	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	257	S	65
Asian	4,736	S	83
Black or African American	21,338	S	54
Hispanic or Latino	10,627	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	139	S	72
White	47,145	S	73
Two or more races	3,893	S	68
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,306	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,438	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	37,569	S	54
Migratory students	30	S	43
Male	44,853	S	66
Female	43,282	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. For the 2011-2012 school year, Virginia administered new mathematics assessments which affected the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient.			

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	93,593	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	90
Asian	5,774	S	95
Black or African American	21,730	S	82
Hispanic or Latino	10,914	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	141	S	91
White	50,574	S	93
Two or more races	4,185	S	91
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,513	S	71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,124	S	69
Economically disadvantaged students	37,945	S	82
Migratory students	29	S	72
Male	47,768	S	88
Female	45,825	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	93,888	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	275	S	88
Asian	5,890	S	92
Black or African American	21,762	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	11,039	S	78
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	144	S	90
White	50,593	S	93
Two or more races	4,185	S	91
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,507	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,484	S	57
Economically disadvantaged students	38,150	S	79
Migratory students	30	S	67
Male	47,924	S	88
Female	45,964	S	87
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	82,341	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	261	S	77
Asian	4,386	S	90
Black or African American	20,796	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	9,997	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	91	S	74
White	43,403	S	81
Two or more races	3,407	S	77
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,988	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,671	S	52
Economically disadvantaged students	35,191	S	61
Migratory students	22	S	50
Male	42,254	S	72
Female	40,087	S	76

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 6 reading/language arts.

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	93,545	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	283	S	92
Asian	5,637	S	96
Black or African American	22,268	S	81
Hispanic or Latino	10,567	S	85
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	112	S	89
White	50,671	S	93
Two or more races	4,007	S	91
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	12,189	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,402	S	68
Economically disadvantaged students	37,158	S	81
Migratory students	21	S	57
Male	47,974	S	87
Female	45,571	S	91

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 6 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 6 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 6 reading/language arts.

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 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	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was	# Students Scoring at or Above	Percentage of Students Scoring at or
All students	70,417	S	58
American Indian or Alaska Native	253	S	55
Asian	4,323	S	82
Black or African American	16,230	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	8,262	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	95	S	48
White	38,350	S	66
Two or more races	2,904	S	61
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,536	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,563	S	33
Economically disadvantaged students	27,727	S	40
Migratory students	S	S	N<
Male	36,305	S	56
Female	34,112	S	59

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 7 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 7 reading/language arts.

For the 2011-2012 school year, Virginia administered new mathematics assessments which affected the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient.

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	91,972	S	88
American Indian or Alaska Native	334	S	84
Asian	5,301	S	94
Black or African American	22,015	S	79
Hispanic or Latino	9,854	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	135	S	86
White	50,378	S	92
Two or more races	3,955	S	91
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,506	S	62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,555	S	68
Economically disadvantaged students	35,208	S	79
Migratory students	13	S	69
Male	47,076	S	86
Female	44,896	S	90

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 7 students taking higher level mathematics courses and the associated assessments. Therefore, fewer grade 7 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 7 reading/language arts.

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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 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	67,622	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	S	59
Asian	2,973	S	82
Black or African American	18,311	S	42
Hispanic or Latino	7,740	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	102	S	62
White	35,408	S	67
Two or more races	2,851	S	65
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,683	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,265	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	29,211	S	45
Migratory students	14	S	50
Male	35,416	S	57
Female	32,206	S	62

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science and reading/language arts.

For the 2011-2012 school year, Virginia administered new mathematics assessments which affected the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient.

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	92,682	S	89
American Indian or Alaska Native	294	S	91
Asian	5,419	S	95
Black or African American	22,485	S	80
Hispanic or Latino	9,784	S	84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	133	S	91
White	50,792	S	93
Two or more races	3,775	S	92
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	11,897	S	66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,872	S	72
Economically disadvantaged students	34,521	S	80
Migratory students	15	S	80
Male	47,658	S	88
Female	45,024	S	91

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science and reading/language arts.

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	88,308	S	92
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	S	92
Asian	5,246	S	95
Black or African American	21,122	S	84
Hispanic or Latino	9,663	S	85
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	133	S	95
White	48,274	S	96
Two or more races	3,588	S	95
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,991	S	71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,120	S	69
Economically disadvantaged students	32,896	S	84
Migratory students	14	S	86
Male	45,340	S	92
Female	42,968	S	92

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In Virginia, mathematics instruction is accelerated. There are grade 8 students taking the end-of-course Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry assessments associated with high school courses. Therefore, fewer grade 8 mathematics assessments are taken than grade 8 science.

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	286,377	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	932	S	66
Asian	19,199	S	89
Black or African American	65,457	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	29,884	S	65
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	462	S	73
White	159,123	S	79
Two or more races	11,320	S	76
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	25,955	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,887	S	58
Economically disadvantaged students	89,081	S	59
Migratory students	41	S	56
Male	143,242	S	71
Female	143,135	S	74

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end-of-course mathematics assessments administered than reading/language arts assessments.

For the 2011-2012 school year, Virginia administered new mathematics assessments which affected the percentage of students scoring at or above proficient.

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	92,672	S	94
American Indian or Alaska Native	328	S	91
Asian	5,416	S	96
Black or African American	22,390	S	88
Hispanic or Latino	9,101	S	91
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	123	S	96
White	51,839	S	96
Two or more races	3,475	S	96
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,237	S	75
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,192	S	68
Economically disadvantaged students	27,781	S	88
Migratory students	20	S	80
Male	46,733	S	93
Female	45,939	S	94

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	241,281	S	92
American Indian or Alaska Native	817	S	91
Asian	14,484	S	95
Black or African American	55,895	S	84
Hispanic or Latino	24,798	S	85
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	371	S	91
White	135,402	S	95
Two or more races	9,514	S	94
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	23,073	S	72
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,205	S	71
Economically disadvantaged students	75,795	S	84
Migratory students	39	S	85
Male	120,057	S	92
Female	121,224	S	91
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are more end-of-course science assessments administered than reading/language arts assessments.			

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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	2,166		
Districts	225		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There are 1838 schools in Virginia. There are 132 divisions. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Adequate Yearly Progress ratings are not required for the 2011-2012 school year.			

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 SY 2011-12 . 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	728		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	490		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	238		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Adequate Yearly Progress ratings are not required for the 2011-2012 school year.			

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
132		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Adequate Yearly Progress ratings are not required for the 2011-2012 school year.		

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	10
Extension of the school year or school day	6
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	11
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	9
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	3
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	10
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.
*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 state's Standards of Accreditation and alternative governance restructuring requirements under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

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 for 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 for improvement or corrective action.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
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 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Under the provisions of Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility application, Adequate Yearly Progress ratings are not required for the 2011-2012 school year.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	0

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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)AIlocations 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In an effort to meet the varied needs of schools in Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has designed a differentiated technical assistance process to provide direct technical assistance to school and central office personnel via a cadre of highly-skilled retired educators and education consultants. VDOE has worked collaboratively with the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII), the College of William and Mary, Corbett Consulting, the Virginia Association of Elementary Principals, and the Virginia Foundation for Educational Leadership (VFEL) 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.

Collaborative with the College of William and Mary
The Office of School Improvement collaborated with The College of William and Mary to support and develop leadership at the division level through the Division Leadership Support Team (DLST) Project. The goal of the project was to achieve efficient and effective division policies, programs, and practices to enhance growth in student learning through differentiated support to schools. Each participating division leadership team received ongoing support from a VDOE division liaison with extensive experience in public education. Using the Indistar® district improvement indicators as a foundation, the VDOE worked with a division liaison to assist the division leadership team with developing a formalized system of support reflecting best practices to promote and support positive change at the central office and school level.

Corbett Consulting
Corbett Consulting provided technical assistance sessions throughout 2011-2012 that provided background research and information about selected strands of the improvement models, facilitated sharing, and suggested promising strategies and timelines for implementation, made recommendations to division teams regarding 1003(g) compliance and the implementation of the transformation and turnaround models.

Tools Developed by the Office of School Improvement in Partnership with Editure, Istation, the CII, and Casenex
Indistar®, an online portal created and managed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement, was used by both focus and priority schools and LEAs (district, school, and Lead Turnaround Partner staff) to track, develop, coordinate, and report improvement activities. A number of evidence-based practices and indicators were provided to inform improvement efforts, but the system was customized to reflect the user's own indicators of effective practice or rubrics for assessment. Indistar® was used for all schools, and also allows the client to differentiate subsets of schools (i.e. a zone or cluster) so that a separate set of indicators can be used as needed.

iStation's Indicators of Progress (ISIP), is an online computer adaptive testing (CAT) system that administers short tests to determine each student's overall reading ability. The system adjusts the difficulty of questions based on performance, and tracks the performance of individual students, classrooms, and the school over time. Students (required in Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools) were assessed monthly and then grouped by tiers and skill need. The system was used in conjunction with the iStation reading program as well as other programs. iStation automatically reported student achievement each month. This information was used by the assigned external consultants and the SEA to determine subsequent actions.

The Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) was developed by VDOE and Internet Testing Systems (ITS). This Web-based application employs a computer adaptive testing engine to help determine student proficiency in mathematics. The assessment was administered in Tier 1 and 2 schools in grades 5-9 on a computer connected to the Internet. Results from the diagnostic test were available immediately and provided information correlated to the Standards of Learning reporting categories. This information was beneficial in developing and focusing an intervention program for those students who are most at risk.

Virginia developed an electronic query system (through Datacation by Casenex) to provide principals with data needed to make data driven decisions at the school-level. This system was based on the quarterly reporting system required of all schools in improvement during the 2011-2012 year. School and district teams used the quarterly report to make strategic, data-driven decisions in order to deploy needed interventions for students who are not meeting expected growth measures and/or who are at risk of failure and dropping out of school.

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 2011-12 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.

The SOA required schools that were Accredited with Warning, Accredited with Warning-Graduation Rate, or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate to undergo an academic review and prepare a three-year school improvement plan. It is important to understand that Virginia embarked on building SEA capacity to implement the model that will be used to improve focus schools over the past ten years. Specifically, the work began with the academic review process in 2000. To further differentiate work needed in schools, the academic review process was revised in 2005. In 2011, Virginia's accreditation required high schools to meet specific graduation rate targets. The academic review process was revised to include actions for schools not meeting high school graduation benchmarks. Throughout this process, Virginia has leveraged the human capacity needed to implement the work by contracting with outstanding retired educators with experience in working with high-poverty and high achievement schools.

The academic review was designed to help schools identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The focus of the review process was on the systems, processes, and practices that were being implemented at the school and division levels. The academic review team, consisting of Department of Education staff, division staff, and/or independent contractors trained in the academic review process, assisted the school in writing the school improvement plan based on the final report of findings.

The academic review team collected and analyzed data that demonstrated the school's status in implementing these practices. A report of essential actions was provided to the division and school team. The essential actions were aligned with Indistar®. Schools Accredited with Warning were required to use this tool to write the school improvement plan. The
school used the essential actions provided in the report of findings to select the indicators that were addressed in the school improvement plan.

The school-level academic review process was tailored to meet the unique needs and circumstances presented by the school. The first year that a school was rated "accredited with warning" an academic review team conducted a comprehensive review of the areas related to the systems, processes, and practices that were being implemented at the school and division levels as indicated above. Throughout the school's continued status in warning, the academic review process was designed to monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan and provide technical assistance to support the school's improvement efforts.

An academic review team conducted an on-site review and assisted the school in identifying areas of need and writing an effective three-year school improvement plan. Concurrent with developing a school improvement plan, priority assistance was prescribed by the academic review team and approved by the Virginia Department of Education for immediate delivery.

The academic review process also addressed graduation and academic issues as well as the required elements of three-year school improvement plans for high schools that were Accredited with Warning in specific academic areas and/or in achievement of the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index or Provisionally Accredited-Graduation Rate.

High School Academic Process

The Virginia Early Warning System (VEWS) was developed for the Department of Education in collaboration with the National High School Center as a data tracking tool designed to assist schools in identifying which students showed signs that they were at-risk of failure or dropping out. The VEWS indicators were based upon predictors of drop out and graduation that had been validated by national research and by four Virginia school divisions that participated in a pilot program. The VEWS data provided quarterly reports to the school team to track progress on selected indicators. These indicators included attendance, grades, credits earned, scores on SOL assessments, and behavior. The 7-Step VEWS implementation process is available at the following Web site:
http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/early_warning_system/index.shtml.

An academic review contractor that was assigned by the Department of Education, the division team, and the school team

reviewed the VEWS data as well as other available data. These data may have included identifying the number of over-age students at each grade, reviewing PALS data in grades K-3, identifying the percent of students not reading on grade-level at third grade over the past three years, and other significant data the division may have found relevant to strategies needed to prevent students from entering high school at risk of not graduating on time or at all.

The contractors assigned by the Department of Education identified the needs of each school Accredited with Warning (in specific academic areas and/or in achievement of the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index) or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate by reviewing the same data as the division and school teams. The contractor, in collaboration with the division and school teams, customized a framework for improvement developed by either the National High School Center (NHSC) and/or the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII).

As part of the high school academic review process, two teams were established. The division team included the principal of the school rated Accredited with Warning in specific academic areas and/or in achievement of the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index or Provisionally Accredited - Graduation Rate, the division's top elementary, middle and secondary leaders, and membership from Title I and special education. For high schools, the division team reviewed data from the VEWS to make decisions about resources, policies, and strategies that impacted high school achievement (academic and graduation) at all grade levels.

The school team included the school's principal and membership from guidance, special education and instruction. At least one member, other than the principal, of the division team served on the school team. For high schools, the school team utilized the VEWS implementation process in order to identify and intervene with students at-risk of failure or drop out.

The division and school teams used an online electronic improvement planning tool to develop, implement and monitor a comprehensive three-year improvement plan using either the targeted indicators from CII or the broader indicators provided by the NHSC. Once the teams reviewed the data and developed a comprehensive school improvement plan, the plan was monitored for three years. In years two and three, the teams continued to meet, discuss data, modify, and implement the school improvement plan.

For high schools with a low graduation rate, throughout the course of the first year, the division and school teams used the VEWS data and other data to complete an in-depth and thorough needs assessment using tools developed by the NHSC and CII. These tools were customized by the contractor to meet the needs of each school. The selection of the appropriate tool was decided by the contractor, in collaboration with the division and school teams, based on the review of VEWS and other data. The division and school teams used selected indicators to develop a single comprehensive plan that included division and school strategies. The division strategies focused on K-12 needs, while the school strategies focused on strategies needed for student success at the high school.

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.

Public School Choice	**# Students**
Eligible for public school choice	102,503
Applied to transfer	2,713
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,420
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 3,994,468

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	11

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

[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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	**# Students**
Eligible for supplemental educational services	62,610
Applied for supplemental educational services	14,777
Received supplemental educational services	13,538
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	**Amount**
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 13,315,640
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	228,131	224,414	98.37	3,717	1.63
All elementary classes	54,607	54,154	99.17	453	0.83
All secondary classes	173,524	170,260	98.12	3,264	1.88

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.

Elementary School Classes	**Percentage**
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	71.50
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	19.90
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	8.60
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Secondary School Classes	**Percentage**
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)	55.60
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	32.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.00

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.

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	13,679	13,546	99.03
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	18,829	18,688	99.25
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	28,873	28,022	97.05
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	55,680	54,983	98.75

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	64.20	28.00
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	55.60	26.00
Poverty metric used	Virginia uses the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
No	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	97,837
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 Receiving Services	**#**
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	97,507
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	62,068
Arabic	4,979
Vietnamese	3,291
Urdu	2,690
Korean	2,527

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 students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	89,086
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	8,751
Total	97,837
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students reported as not tested on the ELP assessment may reflect a discrepancy between the 2010-2011 ELP assessment data reported by certain school divisions and state records. VDOE is examining data to determine the source of the discrepancy, and will provide technical assistance as necessary to correct the issue.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15,509
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17.41
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	**#**
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	88,903
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	8,604
Total	97,507
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of students reported as not tested on the ELP assessment may reflect a discrepancy between the 2010-2011 ELP assessment data reported by certain school divisions and state records. VDOE is examining data to determine the source of the discrepancy, and will provide technical assistance as necessary to correct the issue.	

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	**#**
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.	20,990

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

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
1. defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **Attained Proficiency =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of
3. English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State 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 percent of students 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%).

Title III Results	**Results #**	**Results %**	**Targets #**	**Targets %**
Making progress	64,154	94.46		66.00
Attained proficiency	15,479	17.41		17.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 (MFLEP) 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
14,697	14,029	28,726
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
22,780	S	79	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
19,633	S	96	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
12,763	S	94	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	**#**
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	57
////////////

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
23,822	3,329	20

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 educational 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) v The term µLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course v (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.

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,162
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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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	52	//////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	45	//////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	43	//////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	36	//////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	32	//////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	//////////////////
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	51	14,525
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	51	4,699
PD provided to principals	51	1,620
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	51	1,620
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	45	1,938
PD provided to community based organization personnel	31	1,017
Total	280	25,419

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/27/11	11/18/11	115
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: http:1/www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia has no persistently dangerous schools.	

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 automatically calculated.

LEAs	**#**	**# LEAs Reporting Data**
LEAs without subgrants	101	101
LEAs with subgrants	31	31
Total	132	132
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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)	108	443
K	450	1,343
1	473	1,282
2	416	1,164
3	385	1,076
4	376	1,133
5	384	987
6	331	941
7	315	892
8	230	834
9	327	979
10	258	826
11	179	685
12	290	833
Ungraded		
Total	4,522	13,418
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia has no homeless children or youth students under the classification of ungraded.		

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	618	2,004
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,145	9,474
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	72	214
Hotels/Motels	687	1,726
Total	4,522	13,418
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 Birth Through 2	262
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	594
K	1,278
1	1,230
2	1,143
3	1,086
4	1,071
5	961
6	879
7	862
8	779
9	926
10	764
11	673
12	745
Ungraded	
Total	13,253
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Virginia has no homeless children and youths students under the classification of ungraded.	

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,457
Migratory children/youth	41
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,907
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	1,629
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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	1,276	920
4	1,345	1,010
5	1,199	909
6	1,106	826
7	1,028	774
8	923	695
High School	833	683
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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	1,277	488
4	1,350	595
5	1,198	545
6	1,055	547
7	928	288
8	819	309
High School	2,403	1,171
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science 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	1,171	904
4		
5	1,204	848
6		
7		
8	877	696
High School	2,114	1,635
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	82
K	64
1	62
2	53
3	52
4	57
5	54
6	40
7	28
8	20
9	23
10	24
11	24
12	15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	62
Total	660

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 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.

For the past seven years, the Virginia Migrant Education Program (MEP) has experienced a decrease in the number of migratory students served due to families leaving the state, settling out, and an increase of male workers. In addition, the largest MEP in the state experienced a decline in the number of crops planted due to tomato broker bankruptcy as well as an increase in the number of newly arrived Haitians finding permanent work.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	45
K	51
1	46
2	39
3	38
4	41
5	42
6	39
7	18
8	15
9	15
10	14
11	13
12	11
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	29
Total	456

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 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.

For the past seven years, the Virginia Migrant Education Program (MEP) has experienced a decrease in the number of migratory students served due to families leaving the state, settling out, and an increase of male workers. In addition, the largest MEP in the state experienced a decline in the number of crops planted due to tomato broker bankruptcy as well as an increase in the number of newly arrived Haitians finding permanent work.

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 Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) system to generate the 2011-2012 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 MSDC database system to generate the 2010-2011 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, 2011, through August 31, 2012.

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 was added to the national COE. This included: 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 2011-2012 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 local 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. Through the Virginia Coordinators' Academy, school divisions are reminded 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 is 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 include: 1) ESL services and limited English proficiency (ELP) level;
2) referred services; and 3) achievement of GED. The teacher/recruiter indicates the type of instructional support or referred services the student received. Local assessment data are also collected. 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.

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 local 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 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 MSDC. 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.

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 the qualifying arrival date to ensure students whose eligibility has expired is not included in the child count. Children served under the Continuation of Services provision are also excluded for funding purposes. 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, through the Virginia Coordinators' Academy, training and updates on eligibility requirements and the MSDC system are provided for local migrant coordinators. Technical assistance is provided by the Virginia Department of Education as needed throughout the year.

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 2011-2012 school year. Following section 200.89(b)(2) found in the Code of Federal Regulations effective August 28, 2008, Virginia sampled 103 COEs from the current year's eligibility pool. The COEs were randomly sampled from migrant education programs and 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 2012.

Of the 103 migrant families randomly sampled for the re-interview process, 45 re-interviews were conducted. From the 45 re-interviews, all were found eligible. The remaining 58 families sampled were not interviewed based on the following reasons: 1) declined interview; 2) moved prior to the process; and 3) were unable to be contacted after multiple attempts.

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 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 division 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 reviews 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. Prior to submission of Category 1 and Category 2 child counts, at the state level, migrant data from the MSDC system are cross-checked against internal state eligibility/funding reports. Verification and review of the following data elements are completed to ensure accuracy: 1) birth date (removal of children from birth to age two; 2) qualifying arrival
date; 3) enrollment date; and 4) the exclusion of children served under the Continuation of Services provision, to include previously eligible secondary students. In addition, 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 to ensure consistency.

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, ongoing communication with local migrant coordinators is maintained throughout the school year. Guidance is provided via e-mail, webinars, and face-to-face meetings. Technical assistance has been provided in the following areas: clarifying key federal definitions; eligibility scenarios for beginner through advanced recruiters; review of enrollment practices from the Office of Civil Rights; the use of the Migrant Student Data Collection (MSDC) reports and the national Migrant Student Information Exchange; and updates to the Identification and Recruitment manual are conducted as needed.

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.